App.F.IX-4

1921-2 File No. 1/57/21

Previous References (CB)
CB 2 39-20-1106 (Compte Col 119)
CB 38-18-1202-5 (" " 362 Vol II)
G.M. 346-22-1-36
Jud Dn 866 (Section II)
B

Serial Nos. 1 to 34

Later references.
CB 190-11-1,5,7 6-18.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 34

Part B for April 1916

SUBJECT

Suit filed in the District Court Bangalore, by Mrs. Veenakshiammal, widow of the late Mr. K. Doraswamiayya, for partition of the properties.

To

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao ~~[illegible]~~ & D. Shama Rao

Rs 2759-60 Dy 17/4/16

Sanctions a fee of Rs 750/- to Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao & Rs 250/- to Mr. D. Shama Rao for having conducted the case on behalf of Government

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT 245

JUDICIAL Abstract of Tappal – Dated 27th December 1921.

A556

No.	From whom	Brief Abstract
	Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.	Reports that an accidental fire is stated to have broken out in Lambanihatti a hamlet of Mallenahalli, Kadur Taluk, resulting in the loss of two bullocks, three cows, two goats and the destruction of 11 thatched houses and other pro-perty valued at Rs.578-8-0 and that one boy is said to have died from the effects of scorching two days after the incident.
	The District Judge, Bangalore Division.	States that Meenakshiammal widow of late Mr. K.Doreswami Iyer has filed a suit in his Court for the partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the estate and that as one of the items form-ing the estate was purchased by Govt. and the sale-deed was drawn up in favour of the Dewan Saheb he has been included as one of the defen-dants in the case which stands posted to the 2nd February 1922 for settlement of issues.

Registrar.

G. R. S. III-2]

2453

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 181 of 19

Serial No.	
	From the Dt. Judge, Bangalore No. 9645 dt 23-12-21 states that Ramakkiammal widow of the late Mr. K. Devanaiya has filed a suit in his Court for partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the Estate that as one of the items forming the Estate was purchased by the Govt the Sale deed having drawn up in favour of the Dewan, he has been included as one of the defendants as can be seen from the copy of the plaint sent that the case stands posted to 2nd Feb 1922. Copy of the plaint said to have been forwarded has not been received. 2 Draft Subrd 3. Issued & resubmit Recd 31/12/21 3-1-22 Dy 3/1
2	To the Distt Judge, Bangalore. No. 3918/C.B dt 4. 1. 1922 With reference to Sl. 1, above requests to send the plaint copy to be (1) Resubmitted as directed Recd 4/1/22 2nd Member Chief Secy Dy 4/1/22 by 6/1

2610 4/1/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CB File No. 151 of 1921

(2

2453
2655

Serial No.

5. Let Sri Ramakrishna Mudaliar be instructed to appear in this case.

Init
5/1/22

6. After receiving orders, submit to Demand for perusal

Init
9.1.22

3 From

The 2nd Judge, Bangalore Dis No. 2758 643 6.1.22

Forwards copy of the plaint in the above suit.

7) Draft submitted.

Init 10/1/22 8) The plaint (exhibit at the end) shows that Mr K. Shankaranarayana Rao, now Govt Adv: has appeared for the plaintiff.

Rm 10/1

Chargeable

Misc Memo)

Sgd

3673 11.1.22

9) As he has appeared, he will make to instruct him that he is unable to appear & will ask him not to file any document hereafter.

Init 11/1

10) Issue

Sgd 11/1

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(3

C. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C. B File No. 151 of 1921.

Serial No.	
4.	To The Distt Judge, Bangalore Dr. " Govt Advocate. " Registrar, Chief Court. No 4277-9/C.B dy 12.1.1922 directs the Govt Advocate to appear in the case referred to in SC 1
5	From The Govt. Advocate in Mysore No. 363 dy 17.1.22 With reference to the above states that as he himself has filed the suit on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above case, he is precluded from appearing on behalf of the Defendant & requests that arrangements may be made for the engagement of some other Senior Advocate for the purpose & the Sanction of Govt. may be obtained for his Continuing in the case on behalf of the Plaintiff. Submitted. The Case stands posted to 2nd Feb. 22 for settlement of Issues. Recd 22/1/22 another advocate has to be engaged engaged - Perhaps Mr Ramachandra Rao may be engaged (his merits) - I believe Mr Ramachandra Rao is in Court with the case. The usual notice which was ordered may be issued. The Govt Advocate

3798/29/1

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(4

3082
2453
2912
2855
2453

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 19

Serial No.

[illegible] 2 a suitable lawyer & report his name - when put for approval

24/1/

[illegible]

31/1

Issued
Now
30/1/22

Issued
31/1

To the Govt Advocate
No 482 dt 30/1/22

Requests him to engage the services of a suitable lawyer for the Case & report the matter to Govt for approval

From the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore
States that the Accused Defendants (including the Dewan of Mysore) were to appear to day [2-2-22] & that the Case has been postponed to the 9th Feby and enquires whether he should appear on behalf of the Dewan.
Submits with Respt.

Issued
3/2/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

[illegible] 3/2/22 Issue a suitable Govt pleader to appear in the matter & report the result 3/2/22

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19

Serial No.

Dept D.O. is sent as instructed personally.
KMV
8/2/22
The registered sale deed will have to be given to the Advocate for his reference to enable him to adopt the written Statement

Bdy
7/2

Chargeof

Shm
8/2

To M Ramachandra Rao Esq
Advocate, Bangalore

No 5722 dt 8/2/22

Forwards Copy of the plaint in the Suit filed by Meenakshi Ammal and Requests him to kindly appear for the Case on behalf of the Dewan

Copy to the Govt Advocate to
behalf Engrs.

Result.

KMV
8/2/22

Mr Dewan, Bahadur to papers were sent, Mr Ramachandra Rao might be engaged at once and

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(6

3082
3201

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C. B. File No. 151 of 1921.

Serial No.

the question of engaging the Public Prosecutor's assistance may be taken up. The Ramachandra Rao has resigned & appointed.

8/2

Mins Members) Ins 8/2
8/2

From Mr. M Ramachandra Rao,
Advocate
~~No 3082 dt 7/2/22~~ D.D. 29/2/22
~~Forwards a Copy~~
States that he would appear for the Defence in the Case.

From Mr. Narayanaswami Naidu,
Public Prosecutor
Letter 29/2/22
Regrets under the circumstances & states that his Services may also be engaged for the Case.

Draft as per orders on the letter to be sent
Hm
15/2/22

Approved
Ins 8/2
Mins Members) 13/2

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C P. File No. 151 of 1921. 3201

Serial No.	
11	To The Govt Advocate for communication to the Public Prosecutor. and Mr Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore The Comptroller No 5165 7/C.P. dy 14. 2. 1922. Directing that the services of Mr M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore and Mr C. Narayanaswami Naidu, Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division be engaged for conducting the case on behalf of the
12.	From The Public Prosecutor, Bangalore. Letter dy 17. 2. 1922. Forwards a Vakalath and requests to get it signed by the Dewan Saheb and returned to him with the sale deed of the late Mr. K. S. Doraiswamy Iyer's house and other connected papers &c Submitted 20/2/22.
13	To the Comptroller No. 5257 dy 20. 2. 22 Requesting him to forward for reference the sale deed & other documents relating to the purchase of 'Kumara Park'
14	From do No. SL. 1334 dy 21. 2. 22 Forwards the documents referred to above.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

3372

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CB File No. 157 of 1922.

Serial No.	
	Submitted with a draft forwarding the sale deed to Mr. M. Rama Chandra Rao Advocate. The Public Prosecutor has sent a Vakalat for being signed by the Dewan. But both the Public Prosecutor & Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao have been engaged by Govt. Issue. Encl. the Vakalat signed by the Dewan when Mr R Rao brings his also 23/2
15	To M. Ramachandra Rao Esq Advocate, Bangalore. No. 5325/CB. dy 25-2-1922. Forwards the sale deed and other documents relating to the purchase of "Lumar a Park" &c. and requests an acknowledgment. To The Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division. No. 5326/C.B. dy 25-2-1922 Forwards copy of the letter referred to above.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. H. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No. 151 of 1921. 3748

Serial No.	
16	From Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao. Advocate, Bangalore city Letter dy 27th Feby 1922. Acknowledges the receipt of the documents forwarded with Sl. 15 supra and proposes to forward in due course a draft written statement for approval.
17	From Mr M. Ramachandra Rao Advocate, Bangalore. Letter dy 28. 3. 1922. Forwards a copy of the written statement for signature of the Dewan.
18	To Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao. Advocate, Bangalore . eN. 6023/CB dy 29. 3. 1922. Returns the statement referred to in Sl. 17 above duly signed by the Dewan.
19	From Mr. C. Narayanaswamy, M.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor. Letter dy 29. 11. 22. Requests that the sale deed or deeds executed by the late Mr. K.S. Doraswamy Iyer in favour of Govt for purchasing some of his sites in Mysore about the year 1913 may be sent to him as they have to be filed in the above case.

Draft submitted.
Govt
30.11.22.
pm

30/V

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(10

G. R. S. III-2, 5m A

General and Revenue Secretariat.

P. File No. of 1922. 1754 (640)

Serial No.	
20	To The Comptroller, D.O. no 3459 & 1.12.22 Requests that the sale deed of building sites in Mysore may be sent for reference
21	From The Comptroller, D.O. no S.L. 2300 & 5.12.22 forwards the sale deed called for. In G.O. & 13.2.22, ~~both~~ Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. Narayanaswami Naidu have both been engaged for conducting the case. The sale deed & other documents relating to the purchase of Kumara Park were sent to Mr. Ramachandra Rao on 25.2.22. Whether this sale deed also may be sent to Mr. Ramachandra Rao is for orders. Two drafts are submitted for approval or other orders. Sent 8/12.22. Chetty 11/12 May send. (in sealed cover) 11/12
22	To The Comptroller, no. 3671 & 13.12.22 Acknowledges the receipt of the sale deed.
23	To Mr. Ramachandra Rao Grn, Advocate, 3669 & 13.12.22 Forwards the sale deed in a sealed cover no 3670 & 13.12.22; Copy to Mr. C Narayanaswami Naidu, Public Prosecutor.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(11

497

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No. 151 of 1921

Serial No.	
24	From Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, No 2 & 2.1.23 Acknowledges the receipt of the sale deed sent with GL 23 supra.
25	From Messrs. Ramachandra Rao & C. Narayana Swamy Naidu- letter & 22.9.23: Requests that an advance of Rs 1,000 may be placed at their disposal to meet the expenses in connection with the cross examination of witnesses by Commission etc. Chief Secretary's note on the letter:- "The advance asked for is necessary in the circumstances and may be sanctioned." (Sd) K.M. 22.9.23 Dewan) Dewan's order 'I agree' (Sd) A.R.B 23.9.23 Chief Secretary's note Issue with Fin Secy's concurrence (Sd) K.M. 27.9. Fin. Secy's note (Sd) ~~M.N.K.~~ (Sd) M.N.K. 28.9.23
26	G.O. No. 1093-4 & 29.9.23. Requests the Comptroller to place an advance of Rs 1000 at the disposal of Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao & C. Narayanaswamy Naidu, subject to adjustment on receipt of a bill after the case is decided.

Fin B

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No. 151 of 1921. 861/27

Serial No.

27

From

Mr. C. Narayanasami Naidu, Special 1st class Magistrate, Chikmagalur, letter no 110 & 19.11.27

Suggest that in his place Mr. D. Shama Rao, Advocate, Bangalore city, be engaged ~~for conduct~~ to assist Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao for conducting the case Veerabhadramma vs Dewan of Mysore.

The order appointing Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao v Mr. C. Narayana-Sami Naidu for conducting the case on behalf of the Dewan is flagged D.

Submitted with reference for orders.

G. 151-21-11
D. 13.2.22.

Amst
29.11.27.

Forwarded with compliments to the L.M. Secretary requesting his opinion as to whether the services of Mr D. Shama Rao Advocate for Narayanaswami Naidu (Mentioned in the previous letter) may be dispensed with.

29/11/27

There is already a Counsel to watch Mr. Ramachandra Rao engaged in the case. Mr C. Narayanaswami Naidu was engaged at the instance of the Public Prosecutor. The Counsel now Mr Ramadoss engaged in the case should work with Mr. Ramachandra Rao

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

861 (13

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C. S. File No. 151 of 1921.

Serial No.

I make this proposal to avoid any chance, that when the present Public Prosecutor who is, leaves he does not have a Rao Chief Secretary!

24/11

Mr. Rao said that Mr Ramaswamy's appearance may be regarded as his supporting the plaintiff's case

23/11

L.A.L. Secretariat Complex

Mr. D. Sharma Rao may be appointed in place of Mr. C. Ramachandra Reddy.

Chief Secretary with Compliments

4/12

This may be approved.

5/12

Sharma Please submit to Govt. Can A.G. be engaged in the Mysore case?

Yes

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No. 151 of 1921

861

Serial No.

HH09
10-12-23

First member

8/12

If the Karnataka Government is appearing in many High Courts and engaging their Advocates, the Government may appoint

Govt. Public Prosecutor may conduct civil cases against the Govt. because he is the Law Officer of the Govt. to look after Govt. In such cases the Karnataka Government may engage Advocates.

Dewan. Secy 9/12

11.1

10/12

A draft order is submitted.

Secy 13/12

13/12

28 G.O. No. 1973 - 6 & 14.12.23

Engages the services of Mr. D. Shama Rao Advocate, Bangalore, in place of Mr. C. Narayana Swamy Naidu transferred as Special Magistrate

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | C. B. File No. 157 of 1924.

Serial No.

From

Mr. D. Shama Rao, Advocate, letter dt 7.1.24

Forwards a Vakalatnama for the signature of the Dewan.

Note of the Chief Secretary (in charge)

"The accompanying Vakalat may kindly be signed & sent to me"

(Sd) B. N.
7.1.24

Dewan)

Dewan's order

Case has to be watched

(Sd) A. R. B.
8.1.24

Draft submitted.

8.1.24.

under Secretary's order

'Issue'

(Sd) C. S. K
8.1.24.

To

Mr. D. Shama Rao, No 2259 dt 9.1.24

Forwards the Vakalatnama duly signed by the Dewan.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

C.B. File No. 15/1 of 1921.

Serial No.	
31	From Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate- ~~not~~ letter dt 6.1.26. States that the suit has been dismissed with costs and that he has applied for copies of judgment & decree. Offg. Chief Secretary's note on the letter "As the copy of the judgment is not necessary and as it may cost much, the copy of decree may perhaps be obtained. I had also a talk with Mr. Ramachandra Rao" Dewan) (Sd) B.V. 6.1.26.
	Dewan's order ~~Copies~~ 'Seen" (Sd) A.R.B.
32	To Mr Ramachandra Rao - letter no 20 dt 12.1.26 States that a copy of the decree may be obtained and forwarded to report early.
33	From Messrs M. Ramachandra Rao & D. Sharma Rao, Advocates. letter dt 13.2.26 Forwards a copy of the decree passed by the District Judge, Bangalore Dist, in the suit Mrs. Meenakshiammal vs The Dewan of Mysore and submits memos showing expenses incurred by each of them in connection with the suit out of the advance of Rs 1000 sanctioned to them and also separate bills of fees of Rs 2000 each for Mr. Rao

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

D

As the Govt Advocate had filed the suit on behalf of the Plaintiff, he could not appear on behalf of Govt and so Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu (Public Prosecutor) were engaged for conducting the case on behalf of the Decree. (vide G.O.No. 5165-7/C.B.151-21-11 dt 13.2.22). They were also given an advance of Rs 1,000 to meet the expenses in connection with the above suit subject to adjustment on receipt of a bill.

Consequent on the appointment of Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu as Special Magistrate Mr. D. Sheshagiri Rao Advocate was engaged in his place from 14th Dec 23.

Out of the advance of Rs 1,000, the Advocates have incurred expenses amounting to Rs 678-15-0, of which Rs 616-8-0 represent T.A. for 3 journeys to Madras.

In the Decree order passed by the District Judge, it is stated that the Plaintiffs should pay to the Decree a sum of Rs 1009-12-0 only, being the cost incurred by him in this suit according to the following memorandum:-

1) Court fee on application	—	1-8-0
2) Court fee for Vakalat	—	0-8-0
3) Service of Process & Subsistence for witnesses	—	7-12-0
4) Pleader's fee	—	1,000-0-0
Total		1,009-12-0

(18

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

C.B. File No. 151 of 192/.

Serial No.

Each of the two Advocates has submitted for sanction a bill of fees amounting to Rs 2,000 for having conducted the case on behalf of the Dewan.

Points for orders are:

(1) Sanction to the expenditure of Rs 648-15-0 incurred out of the advance of Rs 1,000.

(2) Fees to be given to the two Advocates, viz. Ramachandra Rao & viz. T. Shama Rao.

(3) Whether it is necessary to give the same rate to each of them in view of the fact that Mr. Shama Rao was engaged only from Dec. 23.

(4) Whether any fees should be given to Mr. Narayanaswami Naidu, Public Prosecutor, who was also engaged from Feb. 22 to Dec. 23.

Submit for orders with a copy of G.O. re consent of Legal advisers if necessary. L & L Secy may be consulted

17/2/26

MO 18/2

Ch Secy.

In favour of sanction

Secy L & L
to be consulted

R 18/2

A legal practitioner is ordinarily entitled to the maximum amount assessable by the Court. In the present case the maximum assessed is Rs 1000/-

19.2

NOTE Contn. Sheet

WD 264—GPB—10,000—17-12-25
[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat

C.B. File No. 151 of 1921

Serial No.

In this case Mr. Ramachandra Rao was alone engaged to conduct the defence on behalf of Govt Dewan. The brunt of the defence work fell on deft No 1 of the 3 Defts on behalf of Dewan is the same as those of other Defts. From the proceedings of the case it is clear that some eminent Vakils from Madras were engaged on behalf of Defts 1 & 3 that Messrs M. Ramachandra Rao & D. Shama Rao had only to follow the lead of other Vakils.

Mr C. Narayanaswami Naidu late Public Prosecutor represented that the refusal of engagement of Mr Ramachandra Rao would be derogatory to his position as Public Prosecutor & that he was not very particular as to the fees to be paid to him.

It was on these considerations the Govt appointed Mr C. N. Naidu jointly with Mr Ramachandra Rao though another lawyer was not absolutely necessary to conduct the case. Mr D. Shama Rao

Defts 1 & 3 the proceedings at the instance of Mr Narain Swami was engaged in his place after the latter became a Magistrate

Generally when two advocates one a Senior & the other a Junior — are engaged, the Junior advocate receives

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

2/3rds of what is usually paid to the Senior.

Having regard to all the circumstances of the case, I am of opinion that Mr. Ramachandra Rao the Senior advocate, may be paid Rs 1000/- the maximum amount assessed according to rates of cost under rule 56(6) of the Rules for the Conduct of Legal affairs & Messrs C. Narasimhamurti & D. Rama Rao who stepped into the shoes of the former, be paid Rs 670/- (being nearly 2/3rds) - This sum has to be apportioned between them - or say Rs 700/- .

The T.A charged may be sanctioned.

Chief Secy with Compts

S.F. 22.2

Please put up a draft

23/1/26

Draft Submitted

Mr 25/1/26

Member 26/1/26

Secy Seen

(I have no objection to the amount as the matter does not relate to my portfolio)

2/3/26

75/31

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB —40,000—17-12-25

(21)

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

C.B File No. 157/1920 of 192 /.

Serial No.

I do not agree that the Rs 100 may be considered a reasonable fee for the work done by the Pleader in this case. The Pleader was engaged for about seven days in the trial of the case. I think the fee of Rs 100 for the two is not high enough.

4.7

The amount allowed in the decree is only Rs 1000. The separate fee is allowed if a party engages more than one Lawyer. The fee was not fixed at the time. If agreed I shall speak to the Commissioner Revenue & see if we cannot settle it on the basis of a fee of Rs 750 and Rs 400 for the 2 juniors. It is doubtful if we shall recover the costs from the Municipality but action will be taken to prevent it

Please settle action in the case and report

4/3/26

4/3/26

Pryce

Norris, Contr. Shed.

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 192

Serial No.

with reference to the Dewan's Orders dated 8th March 1926 I have had a talk both with Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao and D. Shama Rao, Advocates, who conducted the case on behalf of Government about the reduction of the fees claimed by them. They say that in addition to the long sittings in the District Court they had to be present at the examination of the plaintiff at her residence conducted by a commissioner for 12 days and also to be present at Madras on three occasions when some of the important witnesses were examined and they have charged only moderate fees for conducting the case. They do not consider even the fee suggested by the Secretary, Local & Legis. Deptts. in his note dated the 2nd February 1926, viz., Rs.1000/- for Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Rs.670/- for Messrs. C. Narayanaswami Naidu and D. Shama Rao adequate. but being a Government case, they leave it to Government to fix any fees that may be deemed suitable.

The fee allowed in the decree is Rs.1,000/- A fee of Rs.800 for the Senior Advocate and Rs.500/- for the Junior Advocates may be sanctioned. This will involve a loss to Govt. of Rs.300/- on the Vakils' fee allowed in the Court order in suit No 1000

Dear
750/- S. A
& 250/- Juniors in all
Green Sanctions

14/4/26

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

190

Muzrai Secretariat

Muzr. File No. of 192 .

Serial No.	
	Revised draft Subs
	15/4/26
	Issue
	16/4
34	G O No. 2759-60 dt 17/4/26 sanctioning a fee of Rs 750/- to Mr. M. Panchanada Rao and Rs 250/- to Mr D. Shama Rao for having conducted the Pan

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1-8-22

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc. not intended for permanent record.]

Two drafts are submitted herewith for approval or other orders

CBR
2/3

2-A | Draft I may issue.

Draft II will be required after further Scrutiny

~~Further~~ B

CBR 30/3/31
Asst Sec

A. May issue

B. Yes.

Ray
31.3.31

To
Mr A.R. Nageswara Iyer.
3875/C.B. Dt 2.4.31.
Acknowledges the receipt of certain documents forwarded with his letter Dt 9.3.31.
To submitted with a draft of letter to the Comptroller, returning the Sale deeds.

CBR
W/4

With a letter dated 25.2.1922, 20 documents were sent to Mr M. Ramachandra Rao Advocate, who was then representing Govt. A list of these 20 documents is not found attached to the draft of that letter. It is however presumed that list is the same as the one (H.X) in C.B. 38-18-12 Only one of these 20 has not been returned.

CBR 1/4/31
Asst Sec

Drafts enquiring about the put up

C.S. 151-21-15

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on, this form.

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NO

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., n

Mr. D. M. Ramachandra Rao
Conducted the case on behalf
of Govt in the High Court.
He will have to be asked to
get back the documents
from the Court.

The letter to Mr. A. R. Nageswara Iyer
~~M. Ramachandra Rao~~ may
now issue

13/5/37

A. R. Nageswara Iyer & M. Ramachandra Rao.
Letters of 11.5.37.
to the whereabouts
documents sent for
for before the District
Court B. Lane in appeal
1911 ?

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small sl ps
the notes must be cipied, or slips pasted on
this form

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. | of 193

Serial No.	
	From The Govt. Advocate 16 & 18.8.31. Forwards the Sale deed dy no 7.1931 executed by the late Mr K Devanayaki Amm & others and requests an acknowledgment there for
6.	Submitted with a draft acknowledging the receipt of the document. A draft reminder to Mr M. Ramachandra Rao is also put up for approval or other orders CBR 2/8

Went in person to the Govt Advocates Office and ascertained as to the whereabouts of the remaining documents. The Govt Advocates desires to be furnished with the list of documents sent. If approved a copy of the list may be sent to him (Mr. C)
CBR
3/10)

Sale deed No. 6- Kumara park dated 21.11.1918 has been taken from this file for being sent to the LA Officer, Bangalore city- Mem dated 27.9.27 No 5 LA 25) addressed to the Regr. G. R S (vide also D 1270/27 A.B.)
27/11.12.37. (CS Diary no 1107 dy 11.12.37)

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet

VD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7-30

Case filed by Mrs K. S. Dorasami
against Govt and others in Connection
with the purchase of the "Kumara

General and Revenue Secretariat

CS File No. of 193 . [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

1 Of the 20 documents Obta
from the State Treasury as
per list (flag B) and sent
to Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Advoc
as per his Requisition, on 25.2.192
(Vide CS 157-21-8215), in Connecti
with the above Case, only two
title deeds (flags C & Y) have been
returned to this Office by the
Govt Advocate. And the rest of the
title deeds, ~~documents and Plans~~ etc
were not traceable in that Office.
2 The title deeds & other Connected
documents have to be returned
to the Treasury.
3 Submit for orders whether a reque
may be made to Mr. Ramachandra
Rao in this matter
sd

17/11/38 4 Only the main title deeds
of 1913 & 1918 have been received
from the Govt. Advocate's office. These
will be sent to the Huzur Treasury
Some other papers sent to the Govt Advoc
have not been returned in spite
of reminders. The Government
Advocate may perhaps be
unofficially requested to have

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0514—GPB—30,000—2-9-38

~~Enquiry~~ Careful & enquiry Search made as to the whereabouts of the documents, and ultimate to Govt.

11. Please bring up.

Why were not the documents called for earlier?

Submd CJA 13/12/38

HK 14/12

12 No reply was received from the Govt. Advocate to the enquiries made. Repeated personal reminders ~~were~~ to that ~~Office~~ Office were made, ~~but~~ to their Office, but the subsidiary documents referred to could not be traced there.

CJA 14/12

13 The Govt. advocate might be consulted now.

HK 15/12

14 Draft to Comptroller put up. [After issue, the papers will be sent to Govt Advocate N.O.]

VS 16/12

No W. 32-38/C1, dated 19.12.1938

15 Forwarded, with compliments, to the Govt. Advocate in Mysore.

No. D 23/38-39 dt 20.12.38

Misramuthl

Chief Secretary to Govt.

Serial No.

K.O. M. 41
38-39
9/23.12.38

returned with compliments.

16 As a result of the search made soon after I got this file on the 20th instant, I find that this Office had nothing to do with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer.

17 The suit was filed in 1922 and it finally terminated in what was then the Chief Court before 1929, during the whole of which period Mr. K. Shankaranarayana Rao was the Government Advocate. He having appeared - for the Plaintiff was not briefed for the Government who were one of the Defendants in the case.

18 The very first time I ever heard that Government had not got back the documents said to have been parted with by them was only three days ago, ie., on the 20th instant when I received this file.

19. As a result of a thorough search made by the members of my staff, except a solitary reference in the D.O "To" Register, from the then Government Advocate, bearing No. 16 and dated the 18th August 1931 returning a - document dated the 20th July 1913 and said to have been executed by Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and others in - favour of the Government of Mysore, which is not one of those in the list of documents said to have been given by the Government in 1922, and nothing else was found. The then Government Advocate, Mr. A. R. Nagesvara Iyer was appearing for the chief contesting defendant all - along and therefore, did not represent the Government - at any stage of the litigation. Since, as already mentioned there are no other references whatever in this - office

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-38

this office in regard to the litigation, in what circumstances the then Government Advocate (Mr. A.R.Nageswara Iyer) wrote the letter mentioned above and sent the document referred to therein, is a matter on which I cannot throw any light but is one to be ascertained from him if the Government should deem it necessary to do so.

2. The personal reminders and enquiries said to have been made of the Government Advocate referred to in the notes in the file, from 16th November 1936 when I took charge of this office, cannot possibly refer to me since as already stated above, till I got the file three days back, I never knew anything about these papers. So far as my office is concerned, the Head Clerk told me that sometime back, one clerk from the Confidential Branch of the Secretariat by name Mr. Shankarappa, made an enquiry of him in a very casual and informal manner to which he replied that no papers were available in my office. There is only one other member in my staff and he told me that no enquiry was made of him at any time by anybody.

3. If references are available in the Government to show that papers were sent to my office and that enquiries were made and even reminders issued but without any response as noted in the file, I shall be only too glad to try my very best to make a search myself and report the result of it to Government as early as possible.

Mark. Muthanna

Government Advocate.

H/23.12.38.

CHIEF SECRETARY. 26 DEC. 1938 GOVT. OF MYSORE.

26/12

Serial No.

K.O. M. 401 38-39 dt 23.12.38

returned with compliments.

16 As a result of the search made soon after I got this file on the 20th instant, I find that this Office had nothing to do with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer.

17 The suit was filed in 1922 and it finally terminated in what was then the Chief Court before 1929, during the whole of which period Mr. K. Shankaranarayana Rao was the Government Advocate. He having appeared - for the Plaintiff was not briefed for the Government who were one of the Defendants in the case.

18 The very first time I ever heard that Government had not got back the documents said to have been parted with by them was only three days ago, ie., on the 20th instan when I received this file.

19. As a result of a thorough search made by the members of my staff, except a solitary reference in the D.O "To" Register, from the then Government Advocate, bearing No. 16 and dated the 18th August 1931 returning a - document dated the 20th July 1913 and said to have been executed by Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and others in - favour of the Government of Mysore, which is not one of those in the list of documents said to have been given by the Government in 1922, and nothing else was found. The then Government Advocate, Mr. A. R. Nagesvara Iyer was appearing for the chief contesting defendant all - along and therefore, did not represent the Government - at any stage of the litigation. Since, as already mentioned there are no other references whatever in this - office

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-38

Serial No.

"B"

"X"

22 As already noted in the earlier paragraphs, the documents in question – 20 in number – were sent in February 1922 to Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, who was then representing Govt. in Original Suit No. 11/1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, (Mrs Meenakshamma Vs The Dewan of Mysore) for being filed in that Connection. Of the documents, the registered Sale deeds dated 20.7.1913 and 21.11.18 relating to the purchase of a site opposite the Indian Guests Quarters, Mysore, and that relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park" Bangalore, have been returned and the enquiry made of Mr. Ramachandra Rao regarding the whereabouts of the remaining documents elicited no answer from him.

23 In the circumstances, the Dist Judge Bangalore may perhaps be asked if the documents filed by Mr. Ramachandra Rao have all been returned to him and if not, to send them here.

Submit.

VS 16/1/39

24 Draft of letters to Mr. Ramachandra Rao and the District Judge, Bangalore, put up, as directed.

25 – Rtd.

AMS 23/1/139

(Issued)

VS 16.1.39 Ltd

CHIEF SECRETARY. 11. JAN. 1939 GOVT. OF MYSORE.

NOTE: Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-38

D.O. letter No. II|38-39 d. 31-1-1939 from the Dist Judge, B[illegible]ore Division, stating that only one document viz., a sale [illegible] dated 20-7-1913 executed by Mr K. Doraisami Iyer was filed by the Advocate on behalf of the 7th defendant and that no other documents were filed on behalf of Govt. and that the said sale [illegible] was returned to Mr A.R. Nageswara Iyer in Aug 1931.

Submd for perusal.

26 Mr. Nageswara Iyer returned the sale deed referred to in the Dist Judge's letter to Govt in Aug 1931. Mr. Ramachandra Rao has not yet sent any reply regarding the whereabouts of the remaining documents that were sent to him in 1922. His reply will be awaited

VS 2/2

Yes.
HK
2/2

28 Mr. Ramachandra Rao's reply has since been read. He says that only two documents - Sale deeds d. 20.7.1913 and 21.11.1918 - were exhibited in the case and that the rest of the documents were returned by the Dist Court in August 1926. He states that these documents were returned by him to Govt immediately on their receipt

CHIEF SECRETARY. 2 FEB. 1939 GOVT. OF MYSORE.

Sec

Serial No.

29 There is nothing to show that the documents were read in the Secretariat. As the main title deeds relating to the purchase of the Kumara Park and the site opposite to the Indian Guests Quarters have been read, these papers will be filed after perusal, if approved. Submd for orders.

VS. 6/3

30 Is it not possible to obtain Copies of Sale deeds etc which were sent for refce? The loss of these papers is somewhat mysterious. If Mr Ramachandra Rao returned the papers, is it possible for him to quote the No + Date of the refce?

MS 7/3

31 The file register for the year 1921-22 was once again looked into. There is nothing to indicate that the documents were sent by Mr. Ramachandra Rao. The Branch Diary for the year 1926 is not available as it has been destroyed as time barred. Submd for orders whether the D.G. of Registration maybe addressed to send Copies of the saledeeds for reference.

VS. 8/3/49

32. Please put up a clear Statement showing the documents missing and note in the remarks Col, their value from a legal point of view.

MS 9/3

NOTE Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-83

6025/F

File No. of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

33. It would facilitate the disposal of the case if the Sale deeds relating to the purchase by Govt. of the building site opposite the Indian Guards Quarters, Mysore, and of the "Kumara Park Bungalow, are obtained from the Comptroller and looked into

34. Draft and fair copy letter put up.

35. Issued 10.3.

(ISSUED)

Secy

VS. 11/3/39

Home Secy.

36 The sale deeds* relating to the purchase by Govt. of the site in Mysore and the "Kumara Park", Bungalow, have since been received and are put up herewith. The list of documents sent to Mr. Ramachandra Rao is at flag "R" and of the twenty documents referred to therein, No 16 is the only one available for reference.

A to C

"R"

37 The papers may perhaps be referred to Law Section for a note on the point raised by the Chief Secy in his minute d. 9.3.1939 (overleaf).

Thomas

VS. 17/3 Asst. Secy. (Law)

334 Law Dept 24.3

38 In order to assess the value of the mining documents, it is necessary to know to which properties

Serial No.

they relate. It is likely that most of these Documents (being sale deeds and mortgage deeds) are registered. Copies of these Documents may be obtained from the Sub Registrar's office and sent up.

BKR
5-4-39

(Confidential Branch)

1876, 1878, 1886, 1887, 1883, 1849, 1871, 1885, 1917, 1918 & 1903, 39

The missing sale deeds relate to the years noted in the margin. If approved, the D.G. of Registration will be addressed to obtain copies of the documents from the Sub Registrar's office and send them on to Govt. for reference.

Submit for orders.

VS.
5/4/39

40 Appd.
MK
6.4.39

41 Draft submd

VS.
6/4/39

42 Appd. Issue & bring up.
MK
7.4.39

(Issued)

CHIEF SECRETARY
6. APR. 1939
GOVT. OF MYSORE

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-83

43 These papers relate to the missing of certain documents pertaining to the purchase of "Kumara Park", which were sent in 1922 to Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, in connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer.

44 In Decr. 1921, Mrs. Meenakshiammal, widow of the late Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer, filed a suit in the Court of the District Judge, Bangalore, for partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the estate. As one of the items forming the estate, viz., Kumara Park was purchased by Govt, and the sale deed thereof was drawn up in favour of the Dewan of Mysore, he was included as one of the defendants in the case. Mr. K. Shankaranarayana Rao, who was then the Govt. Advocate, could not appear on behalf of the Dewan in the suit as he had himself filed the suit on behalf of the plaintiff (Mrs. Meenakshiammal). The services of Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao and C.Narayanaswami Naidu, were thereupon engaged for conducting the case on behalf of the Dewan. The title deeds relating to 'Kumara Park' (as per list appended) were sent to Mr. Ramachandra Rao in February 1922 for being filed in the case. Subsequently another document, viz., the sale deed dated 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Govt. of the site opposite the Indian Guests' Quarters, Mysore

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-83

...cuted by Mr. K. Doreswami Iyer was also sent to him. The suit was dismissed with costs by the District Judge, in January 1926.

3. Of the several documents sent to Mr. Ramachandra Rao, the sale deed dated 20.7.1913 referred to above as also only one of the documents sent in February 1922, viz., sale deed dated 21.11.1918 relating to the purchase of Kumara Park executed by Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyer in favour of the Dewan were returned to Govt. in May 1931. "A" "C"

4. As regards the remaining 19 documents, an enquiry was made of Mr. Ramachandra Rao regarding their whereabouts, but it did not elicit any reply. In the meanwhile the Govt. Advocate was also requested to have a careful search and enquiry made as to the whereabouts of the missing documents, but they could not be traced there also.

5. In January last, Mr. Ramachandra Rao was reminded and the District Judge, Bangalore, was also addressed in the matter. The District Judge has sent a reply stating that only one document viz., the sale deed dated 20.7.1913 was filed by Mr. Ramachandra Rao in the case, that no other documents were filed on behalf of Govt. and that the said sale deed was returned to the Advocate in 1931. Mr. Ramachandra Rao, however, states that the rest of the documents not being exhibited though filed in the Court were returned to him by the District Court in Aug. 1926 and that he returned the same immediately to Govt.

SECRETARIAT OFFICE 27 APR. 1939 No. 786

There is, however, nothing to show that the documents were ever received in the Secretariat. As it is however likely that most of these documents are registered, action is being taken to get copies of these documents. Subd. for perusal.

48 Papers are Subd as they relate to loss of certain documents. MS 26/4

26/4/39

CHIEF SECRETARY 26. APR. 1939 GOVT. OF MYSORE.

Dewan)

49 MS 27-4-39 MS 29.4.39

D.O. letter No. 20/38-39 dated 24th May 1939 from the Inspector General of Registration forwarding copies of certain documents specified in the appended list.

52, Copies of 19 documents have been sent, and it is reported that the remaining ⊗ documents could not be traced.

⊗ 8(6) - Sale deed dated 25.7.1878 executed by Muniaamappa in favour of Narasimhanna.

13(a) - Deed of Mortgage dated 8.11.1849 executed by Sunkada Appayappa in favour of Jangamakote Sunnuva Rao.

13(b) - Receipt dated 8.11.1849 given by Sunkada Appayappa in favour of Jangamakote Sunnuva Rao

NOTE Contn. Sheet.

WD 0544—GPB—30,000—2-9-83

6025
P

File No. of 193 .

General and Revenue Secretariat

14. Sale deed dated 11.4.1887 executed by Senappiappa in favour of Mr K. Seshadri Iyer.

15. Sale deed dated 23.5.1888 executed by Mysore Narayanarao in favour of Mr K.S. Iyer.

15(a) Sale deed dated 22.3.1871 executed by Ranjanda bhatta in favour of Krishnappa

17. Power of Attorney dated 16.11.1915 given by M/s K.V. Venkataramaiah alias Venkataramu, V. Seshadri and K. Subramanya Iyer alias Subramania K. Seshadri in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

18. Copy of Power of Attorney dated [illegible] from Mr A.M. Sundaramurthi Mudaliar and four others in favour of Mr D. Raghavachar, advocate

19. Copy of Mortgage deed dated 31.12.1903 executed by Mr K. Doraiswami Iyer and four others in favour of Messrs A. Narayana Mudaliar & Co. Mysore Mall, Bangalore.

51 : with ref to paras 32 and 38

334

Land Acquisition Cases.

2

23/3/-

52 with reference to the property described in the sale deed

6023
D

Serial No.

dated 21.11.1918, please note of the
Sale property or any portion thereof,
is the subject matter of the documents,
the certified copies of which have been
received from the Inspector General
of Regis tration

C.B

POKR
9 6 39

"C"

53. The document dated 21.11.1918 is the sale deed relating to the purchase by Govt. of "Kumara Park", Bangalore, executed by Mr. K. Ramaswamy Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore. The piece of land constituting the "Kumara Park" measuring about 98 acres in all was originally agricultural land included within the limits of Malenahalli village, Bangalore Taluk. Sixteen out of the 28 missing documents are sale deeds relating to the purchase by the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, of whole or portions of Revenue Survey Nos. of Malenahalli village which now constitute the "Kumara Park". The names of the several vendors and the particulars of the property conveyed are noted under.

Sl No	Name of Vendor or Vendors.	Particulars of property Conveyed	Consdn
1.	Channaborappanavara Andanappa.	1 ac 6 g (S.No. 95) 4 ac 31 g. (S.No 65)	474/-
2	Krishnappa and Muniswamappa	4 ac 37 g. (S.No. 58) 0.27 "	448/-

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

File No. of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Name of Vendor or Vendors.	Particulars of property conveyed.	Consideration	Serial No.
Boranayaka.	a. g. 2 8 . S.No. 98	Rs 165/-	
Mallikarjunappa;	0 - 32, SNo 103.	Rs 153/2	
Yellamma	3 - 29, SNo 69	Rs 279/-	
Mariappa.	1 - 3 . S.No 57	Rs 86/-	
Mariappa.	1 - 30. S.No 69.	Rs 142/8	
Narayani.	1 - 18 S. No 97.	Rs 43/8	
Hanmappa and Channappa.	6.28 S.No 60.	Rs 338/-	
Audanappa.	5 - 32 - S.No 63.	Rs 208/-	
Dasappa and Narasimhappa.	3.19 - S No 59	Rs 278/-	
Thimaya and 2 Ors.	5.32 S No 60.	Rs 464/-	
Venkamma.	10 - 22.	Rs 633/-	
Total	ac g. 45 -4		

52. The Inspector General of Registration requested that the remaining documents (mentioned

Serial No.

in the list) could not be traced.

Out of these, only two are sale deeds executed by private parties in favour of K. Seshadri Iyer. The rest do not seem to be connected directly with the sale of the "Kumara Park" to Govt.

Submitted

23/6

We can do nothing more now than send the papers.

24/6

OFFICE OF THE
24 JUN. 1939
GOVT. OF MYSORE

The two original sale deeds, and the copies of certain documents used from the D. G. of Registration, maybe sent to the Comptroller for safe custody.

Draft and fair of letter put up.

24/6

Asst. Secy, Law.

Chief Secy.

26.6

27.6.39

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.



District Court, Bangalore Division,
Dated 23rd December 1921.

From

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
District Judge,
Bangalore Division.

To

K. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

S i r,

I have the honor to state that Meenakhshiammal widow of late Mr. K. Doraswamy Iyer has filed a suit in this court for partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the estate and it has been registered as Original Suit No.11 of 1921-22. As one of the items forming the estate was purchased by the Government and the sale-deed thereof was drawn up in favour of the Dewan Saheb he has been included as one of the defendants which fact may be clearly seen from the copy of the plaint herewith sent. The suit stands posted to the 2nd February 1922 for the settlement of issues, that is, for the appearance of the defendants to put in their defence.

I have the honor to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

DISTRICT JUDGE.

MS.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

Immediate

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191*

Date of issue 4/1/1

Signed by

Section C.B.

File No. 151-21

Serial No. 2.

No. 3918/C.B.

8 4.1.22

To

The Sr. Judge, Bangalore

Sir,

I am directed to ackno
the receipt of your letter No. 2614
23rd December 1921 in the matter o
the Suit for partition filed by
Meenakshiammal widow of the l
Mr. K. Devaswamy Ir and to si
that the Copy of the plaint
to have been forwarded has n
been received. The Same ma

over.

Kindly be sent immediately

I have to

For Chief Secy

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

29907 District Court, Bangalore Division,

Dated 6th January 1922.

C.B. 2655

From

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
District Judge,
Bangalore Division.

To

K. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

S i r,

With reference to your No.3918/C.B.151-21-2 dated 4th January 1922, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of the plaint in Original Suit No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of this court.

send
The previous papers

I have the honor to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

District Judge.

In the Court of the District Judge, Bangalore

D i v i s i o n.

Original Suit No 21-22.

Mrs. Meenakshammal, wife of the late Mr. K.S. Doraswamy Iyer (late Revenue Commissioner in Mysore), about 46 years of age, smartha - Brahmin, residing at Rama villa, High Ground, Bangalore City. — Plaintiff.

Versus.

1. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer, son of Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, about 40 years of age Smartha Brahmin, Agent, Aurangabad Mills, residing at Kumara Cot, High Grounds, Bangalore and also at Aurangabad Mill Buildings, Band Stand, Fort Bombay.

2. K.K. Seshadri Iyer, son of K.S. Krishna Iyer about 25 years.

3. K.K. Subrahmanya Iyer, son of K.S Krishna - Iyer about 23 years.

4. K.K.Doraiswami Iyer, son of K.S. Krishna Iyer about 21 years.

5. K.K. Thyagaraj Iyer, son of K.S. Krishna Iyer about 12 years(No.5 minor by his guardian elder brother No.2 K.K.Seshadri Iyer, Defendants 2 to 5 all Smartha Brahmins residing at Kumar Cot, High Grounds, - Bangalore City.

6. Mrs. Muthu Laxmi Ammal, wife of the late K.V. Venkataram Iyer about 13 years, Smartha Brahmin, minor by guardian father, Mr. Satya Mangalam Kalyana V enkatarama Iyer, - Satyamangalam, Coimbatore District.

7. Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore.

— Defendant.

1052

Under Order 7 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure the Plaintiff abovenamed begs to state as follows:--

1. The plaintiff is the wife of the late Mr. K.S.Doraswamy Iyer who was the eldest son of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, as shown in the accompanying geneological tree. The said Sir K. Seshadri Iyer had also three other sons of whom Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Iyer, who is the 1st - Defendant, is the only surviving son.

2. Mr. Viswanatha Iyer, the 3rd son of the - late

late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer died several years ago leaving an only son, Mr. V. Venkatarama Iyer who also died in or about 1919 leaving his widow, the 6th Defendant abovenamed as his nearest heir. The Defendants 2 to 5 are the sons of the late Mr. Krishna Iyer (2nd son of Sir Seshadri Iyer) who died in the middle of 1917. Mr. K. S. Doraswami Iyer died without issue in September 1917 leaving the Plaintiff, his wife, as his nearest heir. The four branches of the family of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer are therefore now represented by the Plaintiff who is the widow of the 1st son, defendants 2 to 5 who are the sons of the 2nd son, the 6th defendant who is the widow of the 3rd son's son and Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer, 1st defendant who is his fourth son.

3. For some years after the death of the said Sir K. Seshadri Iyer the 4 sons lived together as members of an undivided family. It subsequently dissensions arose between the 4 branches of the family and members thereof began to live separately, to have dealings separately and to all intents and purposes there came to be a division in status though the family properties remained undivided. Matters reached a climax by the early part of 1917 and on or about the 10th Feb. '17, the Plaintiff's husband, Mr. K.S. Dorawsami Iyer got registered notices issued to all the other male members of the family, through his solicitors Messrs. Brightwell and Morseby of Madras, and by this as also other acts and declarations showed an unequivocal and explicit intention to thereafter hold and enjoy his own share of the properties separately.

4. When in reply to his notice of the 10th Feb. replies were received on behalf of the late Mr. K.S. Krishna Iyer controverting some of the points raised in the notice, he got a reply sent thereto reiterating his declaration that he had been divided in status and demanded an immediate division of the properties by metes

and

and bounds. He further called upon the Defendant to give him all the accounts of the family to enable him to find out the actual outstandings against the several brothers and also got lists of all the assets and liabilities of the family prepared with a view to have a division of the properties by metes and bounds. A list of the personal accounts was prepared as also a list showing the allocation of the shares owned by the family in the Aurangabad Mills, Ltd., to the several branches to equalise their interests therein having regard to the outstanding against each branch on their respective personal accounts. But before the division by metes and bounds could be completed the Plaintiff's husband took ill.

5. Apprehending perhaps that he was not likely to survive his illness the Plaintiff's husband, when he was a little better proceeded to Madras, consulted The Hon'ble the Justice Kumaraswami Sastri, Judge of the Madras High Court, in the matter of the disposal of his share of the properties, informed him of the fact that he was divided from the other members of the family in status and got prepared by Mr. Justice Kumaraswami Sastri the accompanying draft copy of a Will. In the early part of September 1917 when he feared that he was not likely to live long, he orally authorised the Plaintiff to take any boy she liked in adoption to perpetuate his lineage. He also executed a Will as per draft given by the Justice Kumaraswami Sastri and kept the same and such other documents of the family as he then had in his custody in a wooden rotary desk and had it locked. About5 or 6 days prior to his death which occurred on 22nd September 1917 he sent over the key to the Plaintiff intimating that the Will that he had executed had been kept in the said table.

6. The 1st Defendant who arrived here a couple of days before the death of the Plaintiff's husband, managed

the day after the death of the Plaintiff's husband, when the Plaintiff was struck down with grief and was in mourning and pollution to take the bunch of keys which the Plaintiff had with her through the Plaintiff's daughter Laxmi Ammal, who was then alive on the pretext that the key of the iron safe was required for the purpose of taking out the records connected with the Mills. The Plaintiff declined to part with the keys at first but the next day when pressed again by her daughter, yielded and fully believing that the first Defendant whom she had brought up from his early days with great affection would not in any way interefere with the important documents etc., gave the bunch of keys to her daughter for being handed over to the 1st defendant who, after getting the same had it with him for several days. The Plaintiff never suspected any foul play and it was only in May 1919 by which time her suspicion had been roused, that on a thorough search made for the Will and other papers relating to the division of the properties that the Plaintiff discovered that the Will and several other important papers had disappeared. The Plaintiff thereupon wrote letters both to the 1st defendant and Mr. C.K. Mahadeva Iyer, her son-in-law, complaining of the disappearance of the Will and calling upon the former to give her her share of the properties.

7. About the same time the Plaintiff came to know that the bungalow known as Kumara Park -- one of the most valuable of the family properties had been sold by the 1st defendant, representing himself to be the manager of the family and to be the guardian of defendants 2 to 5 and of Venkatrama Iyer (husband of the 6th defendant) who was then alive, on or about the 21st November 1919, for a sum of 4 lakhs of Rupees to the seventh defendant. The 1st defendant never consulted

the

the Plaintiff and did not take her consent in the matter of this alienation as he ought to have done. The sale is not therefore binding on her and she is entitled to get her one-fourth share of this property along with a similar share of the other properties described in the schedule attached hereto.

8. Ever since the Plaintiff's husband's death the Plaintiff was demanding of first defendant and his nephews to give her her share in the family properties, and after she found out that the will had disappeared she wrote several letters to the 1st defendant for giving her her share of the properties. She also got registered notices issued to all the members of the family calling upon them to give her - her one-fourth share in the family properties and to the 7th defendant to givery her a fourth share of the property known as Kumara Park - item No. 1 of the 'A' schedule. As in spite of these and other demands repeated from time to time the defendants have failed to giver her her share of the properties and mesne profits and dividends, she has been - obliged to file this suit.

9. At the date of the death of the Plaintiff's husband he was entitled to a fourth share in all the - moveable properties of the family which had vested in him as his own separate share, as he had been divided in status as referred to above. The Plaintiff who is his nearest and sole heir is therefore entitled to that one fourth - share and has therefore brought this suit for the same being separated from the entire properties and separate possession of the same being delivered to her.

10. The Plaintiff who is not well acquainted with the details of all the properties owned by the family has now detailed in the accompanying schedule only such of the - properties about the existence of which she had information. There may be several other properties the existence of which

is

is is not known at present to the Plaintiff. This is a matter which is peculiarly within the knowledge of the 1st defendant. The 1st Defendant is reported to have latterly taken up several shares in the Mysore Spinning and Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Bangalore, the Minerva Mills, Ltd and several other companies out of the funds of the family The Plaintiff, therefore, prays that the 1st defendant may kindly be ordered to furnish details of such properties and the Plaintiff may kindly beawarded a fourth share in scuh properties also.

11. The seventh defendant has been made a party to the suit as he is in possession of item 1 of 'A' - schedule known as Kumara Park having purchased it from defendants 1 to 6 under a Conveyance dated the 21st November 1918 and as the plaintiff who is not bound by that sale has claimed her one-fourth share in this property.

12. The cause of action for this suit has arisen within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court in or about the end of 1918 when she began to call upon the 1st defendant and the other members of the family for separate possession of her one-fourth share of the properties. The cause of action for her share of the rents, dividends and profits of the assets of the family for the past 3 years has arisen in or about the months June 1919, 1920 and 1921 when the dividends in respect of the Aurangabad Mills shares were realized and the rents and profits of all the - immoveable properties accrued due.

13. The value of this suit for purpose of Court-fee and jurisdiction is Rs.4,84,517-1-9 as detailed in the - accompanying schedule of properties and para 14 herein.

14. The plaintiff therefore prays for a decree,

(a)

(a) directing the separation of one-fourth share in all the immoveable properties described in the schedule attached hereto and such other immoveable properties as may be disclosed in the course of the procedingsby metes and bounds and the delivery thereor to the plaintiff. Value Rs.1,49,517-1-9.

(b) directing the delivery of 135 shares out of the 540 shares owned by the family in the Aurangabad Mills, Ltd. to the plaintiff and getting the same duly transferred to the name of the plaintiff, though according to the list - prepared by the plaintiff's husband about 150 shares should be allotted to her. Value Rs.1,35,000/-.

(c) directing the defendants 1 to 6 to pay to the - plaintiff the sum of about Rs.2,00,000/- being the amounts of mesne profits and dividends realized by the defendants one to six during the last 3 years ending the 30th June - 1921 from the immoveable properties and the Aurangabad - Mills shares described in the accompanying schedule. - Value Rs.2,00,000/-

(d) In the event of the Court holding for any reason that the plaintiff is not entitled to get one-fourth share out of the premises known as Kumara Park (Item 1 of 'A' - schedule) which is at present in the possession of the 7th defendants, a sum of one lakh of Rupees may be ordered to be given in lieu thereof out of the sum of 4 lakhs of rupees which is said to be the consideration paid to the defendants 1 to 6 by the 7th defendant under the deed of sale dated the 21st November 1918 together with interest thereon at some reasonable rate from the date of sale up to date of payment.

(e) directing an inquiry as to rents and profits from the date of institution of the suit up to date of delivery of - possession of the Plaintiff's share out of the schedule properties,

(f)

(f) directing payment of dividends in respect of Plaintiff's are out of the 540 shares in Aurangabad Mills and in other shares held by the family from the current year onwards up to the transfer and delivery of the shares as aforesaid to the plaintiff,

(g) for the costs of this suit against the defendants 1 to 6.

(h) and for such other relief or reliefs which this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant having regard to the peculiar circumstances of this case,

Against the defendants 1 to 6 in respect of the entire claims and against the 7th defendant in so far as the Plaintiff's share in item 1 of 'A' schedule known as Kumara Park is concerned.

Signed & Verified in original Copy

"C O P Y

- - - - - - -

SCHEDULE OF PROPERTIES TO BE PARTITIONED.

"A"

	Value for purposes of Court fee of the entire property.			Value of Plaintiffs ¼ share therein.		
Properties situate in Bangalore:--	Rs.	R.	P.	Rs.	A..	P.
1. The Bungalow, Buildings, out-houses etc., with the garden and grounds known as Kumara Park, situated in Seshadripuram, High grouns, Bangalore, about 98 acres in extent bearing Municipal No.9 and bounded on the North by Mr. B.L. Rice's Bungalow, East by the Golf Road, South by the Bungalow known as Kumar Cot and West by the Dharmambudi feeder channel.	4,00,000	0	0	1,00,000	0	0
2. The Bungalow with Buildings and out-houses with its garden and grounds known as Kumar Cot situated in Crescent Road, High Ground, Bangalore bearing Municipal No.10 and bounded on the North by the garden forming part of Kumara Park, East by Public Road, South by Mr.V.P.Madhava Rao's garden forming par of his Bungalow known as Patan Bhavan West by M.S.M. Broad Guage Railway Line and Patan Bhavan Compound.	32,000	0	0	8,000	0	0
3. The Bungalow with outhouses and adjoining garden and grounds known as Rama Villa, situated in crescent Road, Bangalore (High Grounds), bearing Municipal No. 3 and bounded on the North by Waste Land,, on the East by Mr.S.A. Ramaswami Iyer's (Executive Engineer's) Bungalow and Compound, South by the crescent Road, West by the Public Road. (This Bungalow is at present in possession of the Plaintiff)	20,000	0	0	5,000	0	0
4. 9 vacant sites at Seshadripuram with trees etc., standing thereon about ¼ an acre in extent bearing Municipal Nos 9 to 16 and bounded on the North by Mr. T. Govinda Rao's Garden, East by Channel, South by Cross Road, West by Main Raod.	2,000	0	0	500	0	0

5. The Bungalow at present in the occupation of Mrs. Viswanatha Iyer with the other outhouses and ground situate in 6th Main Road, Malleswaram, Bangalore, bearing Municipal Nos. 380 and 381 and bounded on the North by No.11 Cross Road East by another Cross Road, South by Iyengar's house and compound and West by No.3 Main Road, Malleswaram	Rs.32,000/-	Rs.8,000/-
6. The Bungalow with outhouses, gardens and grounds situated in Malleswaram, Bangalore at present being occupied by Srimati Peria Ammani Ammal alias Anantha Laxmi Ammal bounded on the North by Mr.V.P. Madhava Rao's House and garden, ~~North~~ East by No9 Main Road, on the South by 11th Cross Road and West by No.9 Main Road.	16,000/-	4,000/-

- - - - -

C O P Y.

Schedule "B"

Properties situated in Mysore .

Mysore District, Mysore Taluk, Kukkarahalli village, does under the name of "Dewan's Garden" now in the name of Pattadar K.B. Ramaswami Iyer.

Sel.No.	Name of village and Khate No.	Details as dry, garden, etc,	S.No.	Extent. A.	G	Assessment. Rs.	a.	p.	Value for purposes of Court fee of the entire property: Rs. a. p.	Value of Plaintiff's One-fourth share therein Rs. a. p
1.	Kukkarahalli, 'Dewan's garden comprising cocoanut, mango and nut trees, khate No.15.	Dry	27	1	19	1	8	0		
		Do.	28	1	25	1	8	0		
		Do.	29	4	15	4	8	0		
		Do.	30	4	23	5	0	0		
		Do.	31	3	9	3	8	0		
		Garden	32	1	13	2	0	0		
		Do.	33	5	8	8	0	0		
		Dry	36	2	3	3	8	0		
		Garden and dry	57	11	20	18	0	0		
		Do.	58	11	28	22	0	0		
		Dry	59	0	23	0	12	0		
		Do.	60	5	23	6	0	0		
		Kharab	1,62,57) 59 & 60)	7	0	6	3	6		
		District Fund --				57	7	0		
		Ry.Cess ----------				1	5	10		
				60	9	*58	14	8	12,000/-	3,000/-

* The discrepancy of 0-5-8 is due to the deduction of Mr. Anniah Pandit's portion of the Tt. Fund and Railway charges.

- - - - - --

C O P Y.

- - - --- --

List of properties situate in Malabar District:-

	Value forpurposes of Court-fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's share therein.
1. Six Malas (Mountains or large hills covered with forests) and named as follows:-1. Punchakolli 2.Vattikallu 3.Kanyampara 4. Erratamavu 5zParapakalli 6. Vattaku Kotta (otherwise called as North Kottamala). These 1st 5 hills are bounded as:- to the South of Punnapuya and Cheruvalla thodu to the North of Korapuya. to the West Anekal at Cholapuya and Cheria Kavu mala to the west of Punnapuxx. 6th Hill NorthKolttamala is situated to the south of Paranjam thodu, to the North of Thekku Kotta Mala and the Demn of the Zamorin, and to the East of Puyangottu Mala. All six situated in the Nilambur Peson - Vandur Hobli - Varnad Taluk - Malabar District. Note:-- The family of Rangacharlu owns three-fourth of this property and the other one-fourth belongs to the family of Sir K. Seshadri Iyer.		
ii. Areacode Estate: consisting of 52 hills, situate in the Pannikode Assom - Calicut Taluk - Malabar District and bounded on the east by Mathilam para, West by Nadavaserry - Thondunilam Uyachesse, North by Kandankolam Kannopoyil, on the South by Neduparamba - Chelupara theyattu Kandum - Nemani Poyil - Thalapulal Nadu. Note:- The Rangacharlu family owns one-half of this property and the other half belongs to the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer's.		
The value of the interests of the family of the parties in the aforesaid two estates. -- -- --	Rs.80,000/-	Rs.20,000/-

- - - - - -

C O P Y

Schedule "B"

Malabar District, Palaghat Taluk, Killakkatharai Village, No.395 Kumara Puram Deshadri Iyer's son Dora-swamy Iyer, Dy. Kaailsar's No.Dis.371/P.05.

Name and number of villages	Names of plots	Details as dry or wet	S.No.	Extent A.	Extent C.	Assessment. Rs. a. p	Value for purposes of Ct. fee of the entire property. Rs. a. p.	Value of Plaintiff's ¼ share therein Rs. a. p.
Vellangoodu otherwise known asKillakkatharai	Pillaikudu	permanent dry.	256/2	1	0	0 12 0		
			252/11	0	61	0 10 0		
			/12	0	14	0 2 0		
			/13	0	11	0 2 0		
			254/10	0	7	0 2 0		
			256/3	0	9	0 1 0		
			/4	0	22	0 4 0		
			/10	0	2	0 1 0		
			/12	0	2	0 1 0		
			/13	3	45	3 7 0		
	Do.	Wet Land	254/1	1	24	3 12 0		
			/3	0	86	5 6 0		
			/4	1	99	6 0 0		
			/5	1	78	7 2 0		
			/7	7	37	46 2 0		
			/9	2	4	8 3 0		
			/11	0	47	3 0 0		
			256/5	1	18	3 9 0		
			/11	0	4	0 2 0		
			/15	0	22	0 11 0		
	Do.	Puramboke	254/2	1	61	Tank		
			/6	0	9	Waste		
			/8	0	10	Channel		
			/12	0	2	Do.		
			256/9	0	6	Do		
			/14	1	6	Tank		
				25	86	89 9 0	447-13-0	111-15-3

Schedule "C"

'a'

List of properties situate in Malabar District:-	Value forpurposes of Court-fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's share therein.
1. Six Malas (mountains or large Hills covered with forests) and named as follows:-1. Punchakolli 2.Vattikallu 3.Kanyambara 4. Erratamavu 5zParapakalli 6. Vattaku Kotta (otherwise called as North Kottamala). These 1st 5 hills are bounded as:- to the South of Punnapuya and Cheruvalla thodu to the North of Korapuya. to the West Anekal at Cholapuya and Cheria Kavu mala to the west of Punnapuya. 6th Hill NorthKolttamala is situated to the south of Paranjam thodu, to the North of.Thekku Kotta Mala and the Jemn of the Zamorin, and to the East of Puyangottu Mala. All six situated in the Nilambur Peson - Vandur Hobli - Wynad Taluk - Malabar District. Note:-- The family of Rangacharlu owns three-fourth of this property and the other one-fourth belongs to the family of Sir K. Seshadri Iyer.		
ii. Areacode Estate: consisting of 52 hills, situate in the Pannikode Assom - Calicut Taluk - Malabar District and bounded on the east by Mathilam para, West by Nadavaserry - Thondunilam Uyachesse, North by Kandankolam - Kannopoyil, on the South by Neduparamba - Chelupara thevattu Kandum - Nemani Poyil - Thalapulal Nadu. Note:- The Rangacharlu family owns one-half of this property and the other half belongs to the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer's.		
The value of the interests of the family of the parties in the aforesaid two estates. -- -- --	Rs.80,000/-	Rs.20,000/-

- - - - - -

C O P Y

Schedule 'B'

"C"

Malabar District, Palghat Taluk. Nanpalam Pattam, Nanpalam Village, Owner V. Doraswami Iyer etc., son of Sir V. Seshadri Iyer.

Name and No.of Village:	Name of locality:	Details as Dry or wet.	S.No.	Extent. A.	Cts	Assessment.	Value for purposes of Ct.fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's ½ share therein.
No.94 Nanpalam	Pennangnapadam	Wet	1/1	5	85	Rs.17-9-0		
			/3	0	50	1-8-0		
			/4	0	10	0-5-0		
			4/1	11	59	58-0-0		
			/2	0	12	0-8-0		
			/3	0	8	0-6-0		
		Dry Land) Garden)	/4	0	7	0-1-0		
	Kallamparambu	Do.	/6	0	9	Waste		
	Kelandhiruttu) Kallaparambu)	Dry Land Garden	267/1 269/1	8	0 70	Do. 1-6-0	Rs.421-9-0	Rs.105-6-3
	Milavana -- Pennagnapadam) Kallaparambu)	Wet Dry	/2 /3	0 0	44 32	1-5-0 Waste		
	Do.	Garden	269/9	1	10	3-5-0		
	Thindarkadu,) Kallaparambu)	Dry	9/8	1	14	Waste		
	Pazhappallamparambu	Dry	1/2	4	98			
		Total --		35	8	84-5-0		

Schedule 'D' (Moveables)

540 shares of Rs.1,000/- each in the Aurangabad Mills, Ltd., Nizam's dominions. The Plaintiff understands that the family owns more shares. But this fact has to be elicited from the defendants and the Plaintiff's share in such extra shares will have to be given her.	Value for purposes of Court-fee of the entire property. ---- Rs.5,40,000/-	Value of Plaintiff's one-fourth share therein. ---- Rs.1,35,000/-

- - - - - -

C O P Y

- - - - - - - - -

G.R.S. VI–71]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read—

Letter No. 2645/297 of 23rd December 1921 from the Dt. Judge, Bangalore Division stating that Meenakshi-ammal widow of the late Mr. K. Doraswamy Gr has filed a suit in his Court for the partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the estate and that as one of the items forming the estate was purchased by Govt. and the Sale-deed thereof drawn up in favour of the Dewan, he has been included as one of the defendants in the case which stands posted to the 2nd Feb-1922 for settlement of issues &c for the appearance of the defendants to put in their defence.

~~Order Thereon—No.~~

Order:—

Order:— No.

The Govt. Advocate is requested to appear in the above case on behalf of the Dewan.

— Chief Secy. to Govt.

To The Hon. Sir Charles Bayley Kt.
The Govt. Advocate in Chief
Registrar, Chief Court with Civil Cases letter
Copy to Criminal Secy.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1744—GPB —30,000 —17-8-15

30783

C.P. 151-21-5.

WD 978—GPB—500—22-11-21

No. C.B. 2912

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE IN MYSORE
Dated Bangalore 17th January 1922.

FROM

The Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

SIR,

With reference to Government Order No. 4377-9/C. P. 151-21-4, dated the 12th January 1922, authorising me to appear on behalf of the Dewan of Mysore, in the suit instituted by Meenakshiammal, widow of the late Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer, I have the honor to state that as I myself happen to have filed the suit on behalf of the Plaintiff, I regret very much that I am precluded from appearing on behalf of the Dewan. In these circumstances, I request that arrangements may be kindly made for the engagement of some other senior Advocate for the purpose, and that the sanction of Government may be kindly obtained for my continuing in the case on behalf of the Plaintiff, as I was engaged long before my appointment as Government Advocate.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

To

The Government Advocate in [illegible]

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.365 of the 17th instant stating the circumstances under which you cannot appear on behalf of Government in the suit filed by [illegible] widow of the late Mr. P.Doraiswamy Iyer, I am directed to request you to be so good as to engage the services of a suitable lawyer and report the matter to Government for approval.

I have etc.

Chief Secretary to Govt.

For the Dewan Saheb & Defendants Pro Said.

The said order for Commission issued on the application of the Dorasawmy Iyer & the Sale of Sri Seshadri Iyengar impeached in case the Said Sale was set aside & the Court & Vakeel ordered to pay the Commission & the Court should come to be for the evening, Vakeel for the Dewan Saheb moves to declare the Commission appointed for recording the evidence on the 9th Inst. should be void & that Commission issued may be returned &c &c

I have the honour to be

Your most obedient Servt

[illegible]

urgent. Bangalore
2-2-22
C.P. 3082
From
R. 7.
To The Superintendent
Central
Prison
Bangalore

Dated the 1st Reference
his
2/2/22

, the Asst. Secretary
to
the Govt. of Mysore

Sir

I have the honour to
inform you that in S. 11/21
on the file of the Dt. Judge
Bangalore Bhaskara Shetty
Dewan of Mysore & others
was for the appearance
of the accts. today &
adjourned to 9-2-22.
I happened to be in the Court
but could not take
notice of it in the absence
of instructions. I shall
be much obliged to you
if you will kindly let
me know before the 9th inst.
as to how I should act

4889/CB. 3/2/22

Dear Sir,

With Reference to [redacted]

No. 4823/CB of the 31st January 2
Regarding the suit-filed [redacted]
Meenakshi ammal, widow [redacted]
the late Mr. V. Doraisamy [redacted]
I am desired to state that
no body [redacted] seems to have
appeared on behalf of the Promo-
-ters when the case was taken
up for hearing on the 2nd inst.
The case is [redacted]
to have been adjourned
sine die. I am therefore
to request you to kindly
let me know [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[

~~Reply with postage~~ is required

1. Jesus Christ

&

the Holy Ghost

V. Thanksgivings unto the Lord

God's Advocate in Rome

Rec'd
2/2/22

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

Alternate

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* *191* .

Date of issue 8/2/22

Signed by

Section
File No.
Serial No 8

No. 5022/CB.
Encl. 9 8/2/22

To Mr. Ramachandrachar B.A. B.L.
Advocate
Bangalore city

Dear Sir

I am directed to forward herewith Copy of plaint in the case with Counter of Dr. Joshi, Bangalore, which has been filed by Mrs Meenakshi Ammal widow of the late Mr K. Doraswamy Iyer against Mr K. S. Ry Revenue Dept & others and in which the Dewan of Mysore is [illegible] the defendants.

over.

I am to request you to kindly appear on behalf of the Dewan in this case.

Kind reference is invited to paragraphs 7, ~~and~~ 11, and 14(a), (d) and (k) of the plaint. ~~to regard to the matter Concerning to~~

The Chief Secy to Govt and the Chief Engr have been requested to give you all necessary instructions in regard to the subject matter of the Suit.

It is learnt that the Suit has been posted for hearing on the 9th Feb 1922.

Yours Sincerely,

Chf Secy

By
7/2/22.

List of enclosures.

5023/CB. 9.8.22

Copy to ~~the Chief Secy~~ the Chief Engr

BG.

Chf Secy

Copied by

Examined by

5024/CB 9.8.22

Copy to the Govt Advocate.

BG.

Chf Secy

Sc.4

Ramachandra Rao, B.A.,B.L.,
Advocate & High Court Vakil,

64, Balepet,
Bangalore City.
9th February 1922.

Re: O.S. No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore.

Mrs. Meenakshi Ammal -vs- 7. Dewan of Mysore.

Dear Sir,

I thank you for your D.O. letter No. 5022/C.B. 151-21 dated the 8th instant and its enclosure which I duly received yesterday.

I shall appear for the 7th defendant to-day and do the needful.

Received 9/2 I propose to meet you in the course of a few days for obtaining the necessary instructions for the conduct of the case.

Yours Sincerely,
G. Ramachandra Rao

K. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

Bangalore city
9-2-22
81.10.

From

K. Narayanaswamy Naidu Esq.
Public Prosecutor
Bangalore Dr.

To. Madhava Rao. B.A.,
Chief Secretary,
Govt of Mysore,
Bangalore

Today I was present in the Dr Court & when O.S. 11/21-22 was called, to my surprise, Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao appeared for the Dewan Sahib & the lawyers present in court were asking me if the Govt have

lost all confidence in me. This not only have I been deprived of the fat engagement which I have the right to get under the rules. (vide pr. 5 & 6 of G.O. no. 1932-85 dt 02-03 dt/16-3-04) but my reputation has been most undeservedly injured.

I am bound to accept any engagement that is offered to me very often for such low fees i.e. Rs. 2 or 3. But the corresponding obligation on the part of the Court to refer me all briefs especially when the services of the Court Advocate are not available

... in Mysore & Shimoga where the
... Advocate is not available
... engagements (to & the public
... duties) is not fulfilled in
... case. Considering the hard &
... work I have been doing for
... last two years — even without
... myself of the Summer vacn
... sacrifice of my private
... practice. I do not think I
... this treatment at the
... of the Govt.

It is not so much for the fees
that I may get in the case as
the reputation which is at stake

that I am troubling the Court.

Therefore I respectfully
request the Court to reconsider
his decision & to offer me the
engagement & if the Court thinks
it too late & withdraw the
engagement from Mr. Ramachandra
Rao & engage me jointly with him
& do me justice.

I shall be highly obliged
if you will kindly recommend
my case to the Dewan Saheb
& the Member in charge of the
Police & get me the

the joint engagement at least.

In this connection I beg to bring to your kind notice that in a Criminal appeal against the conviction of the Sessions Judge by Division in a Riotting case by Tanukur Bt. conducted by me, Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao engaged for the Govt as the present Govt advocate had accepted the engagement for the accused before his appointment. It is a well known fact that whenever the Govt advocate

otherwise engaged his junior
2 or 3 years standing are
entrusted with important
ases. Such being the case
fail to understand why
in a case conducted by me
am not offered the engagem
request the Court not
prejudice my claims in this
way in future at least
Once more request you to
kindly influence the Court
to retain the joint engagem
in O. S. 11/21-22 & Same no

this very delicate situation
such I am placed
thanking you in anticipation &c

I have the honour &c
Sir
your most obedient Hble
Servt
Public prosecutor

I request you to treat this
matter as confidential as I should
blame a hasty in the drafting
the written statement so that
responsibility may also be joint
Con. Mandr

Pro of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore

Read:-

Letter No 2645/297 dt the 23rd December 1921 from the Dist Judge Bangalore Dist, stating that Meenakshi amma, Widow of the late Mr. K Doraswami Iyer, has filed a suit in the Dist Court for restitution of the family property and possession of her husbands one fourth share of the estate and that one of the items forming the estate has been purchased by Govt & the Sale deed thereof drawn up in favour of the Dewan of Mysore, he has been made one of the defendants in the Case and ordering that the Case stands posted to the 2nd February 1922 for the Settlement of issues &c for the appearance of the defendants to put in their defence.

2. Letter from Judge ending with D/ the No 3b3 dt the 17th January 1922 from the Govt Advocate in

Anyone stating that as he happens to have filed the suit on behalf of the plaintiff, he is precluded from appearing on behalf of the Devaru and that arrangements may therefore be made for the engagement of some other Senior Advocate for the purpose and requesting sanction to his continuing in the case on behalf of the plaintiff as he was engaged long before he was appointed Govt. Advocate.

Letter No. 5022/CB of the 9th February 1922 requesting Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A. B.L. Advocate, Bangalore, to appear on behalf of the Devaru in the case referred to.

Order known
No. 2
C.B. 151-21-

Govt. direct that the services of Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A. B.L., Advocate, Bangalore, and Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu, B.A. B.L.,

Public Prosecutor, Bruxelles

Sir, he ~~jointly~~ engaged for
Conducting the case on behalf
the Crown.

Yours

Sec

Yes Sir

To the Govt. Advocate for
Communicate to the Pub. Prosecutor
Mr. M. Ramaekers Mec

Compliments, Mysore Govt

Mw
11/2/21

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No.2645/297 dated the 23rd December 1921 from the District Judge, Bangalore Division, stating that Meenakshi Ammal, widow of the late Mr. P. Doraisami Iyer, has filed a suit in the District Court for partition of the family property and possession of her husband's one-fourth share of the estate and that as one of the items forming the estate xxxxxxxxxxxxxx has been purchased by Government and the sale deed thereof drawn up in favour of the Dewan of Mysore, he has been made one of the defendants in the case and adding that the case stands posted to the 2nd February 1922 for the settlement of issues, i.e., for the appearance of the defendants to put in their defence.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No.363 dated the 17th January 1922 from the Government Advocate in Mysore stating that as he happens to have filed the suit on behalf of the plaintiff, he is precluded from appearing on behalf of the Dewan and that arrangements may therefore be made for the engagement of some other Senior Advocate for the purpose and requesting sanction to his continuing in the case on behalf of the plaintiff as he was engaged long before he was appointed Government Advocate.

3. Letter No.5022/C.3. dated the 8th February 1922 requesting Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Bangalore, to appear on behalf of the Dewan in the case referred to.

O R D E R No.

Dated, Bangalore, the February 1922.

Government direct that the services of

Mr. S. Ramachandra Rao, B.A., ..., Advocate, Bangalore, and Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu, B.A., B.L., Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division, be engaged for conducting the case on behalf of the Dewan.

Chief Secretary to Government.

T o

- The Government Advocate for communication to the Public Prosecutor.

Mr. S. Ramachandra Rao.

The Comptroller, Mysore Government.

Bangalore
17-2-22

34538 C.B. 151-21-12
C.B. 3336

From

C. Narayanaswamy Chetty
Public Prosecutor
Bangalore

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Govt of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to Govt. Order No. 5165-7/C.B. 151-21-11 dt/13-2-22, I have the honour to send herewith a Vakalath & to request you to get it signed by the Dewan Sahib & send it to me with the Sale deed of the Case Item No. Doraswamy Iyer's house & other connected papers. The case stands adjourned to 14-3-22 for filing defence.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
C. Narayanaswamy Chetty
Public Prosecutor

[illegible]ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1920—21ನೇ [illegible] ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ.

[illegible]

Vs.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ.

[illegible]

ಮಾನ್ಯ [illegible] ಯವರಿಗೆ.

[illegible] ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಬಿಚ್ಚ್ಯರುನರುವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಹೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಹೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಹೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈಜು ವಸ್ತ್ರೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮುತ್ಯಾಪ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಹೊಮದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರ್ಧೇನೆ.

ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತೈರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. } ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತೈರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರ್ಧೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು

ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀ ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ್ವರ ಅಂಡ್ ಕೊ., ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

Sri Venkatesa Press, Bangalore City

3336

151-21-13.

To The Comptroller, Imperial Govt.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to request you to kindly send for reference the Sale Deed and other documents relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park" which were sent to you for Safe Custody with this office D.O. IV. 585 | CB 38-18-12 dt the 17th December 1918.

Yours Sincerely
for
Chief Secy.

Noted
with the Sale Deeds
Hon 22/1/19

Hon
20/2/19

C.B. 151-21-14.
C.B-337

D. O. No.....
B.J.1334

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,

Bangalore, dated 21st Feb. 1922.

Dear Sir,

I send herewith for reference the Sale Deed and other documents relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park" as desired in your D.O. letter No.5257/CB of the 20th instant.

Yours sincerely,

B Nagendra Rao
for Compr

K. Matthan Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
B a n g a l o r e.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191* .

Date of issue 25/2/22.

Signed by Dr Krishnan

Section C.B.

File No. 151 - 21.

Serial No. 15.

No. 5325/C.B. dt. 25/2/22

1 Enc. 20 with case

To

M. Ramachandra Rao Esq BA BL.,
Advocate & High Court Vakil
64, Balepet, Bangalore City

Sir,

In continuation of G.O. No. 5765-7 dt 13.2.22 engaging you & the Public Prosecutor Bangalore on behalf of the Dewan in C.B. 157-21-11 for conducting O.S. No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the Dt. Judge, Bangalore (M/s. Meenakshi Ammal -vs- The Dewan of Mysore), I am directed to forward herewith the Sale deed relating to the Purchase of Kumara Park and other documents (as per list

over.

Enclosed, please find copies of
notice dt 18/4/1921 issued in the matter
drawn by Mr. K. Sankaranarayana Rao
Advocate & the reply of Govt. thereto
bearing No. 2010/CB 239-20-4 dt 10.5-1921
The favour of an acknowledgment
is requested.

A

B

Thanking you

Yours

Chief Secy to Govt.

To
C. N. Narasinga Rao
The Public Prosecutor,
Bangalore City

5326/CB
dt 25/2/22

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

K.Shankaranarayan Rao, M.A., B.L.,
Advocate. CHICKPET,

Bangalore City, 7th/18th April 1921

To

The Dewan of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

We have been instructed by Mrs. Meenakshammal (widow of the late Mr. K.S.Dorasami Iyer) to give you notice, which we hereby do, as follows:-

Our client's husband the late Mr.K.S.Dorasami Iyer, formerly Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, was entitled to a ¼ share in the family properties which he and his brothers had inherited from their father the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer. Our client's husband had by his acts and declarations made during his life time showed an unequivocal and explicit intention to divide from his brothers and in pursuance of such intention had begun to live separately from his brothers and to hold each of his brothers accountable for such sums as each had utilized out of the income from the family properties.

Thus there was a division in status between our client's husband and his brothers and some time before his death our client's husband had executed a will whereby he bequeathed all his properties moveable and immoveable including the share to which he was entitled in the family properties to our client absolutely and authorized our client to take a boy in adoption. Our client is therefore entitled to the ¼ share to which her husband was entitled in the family properties.

One of such properties in which our client's husband had a share is "Kumara Park" and it has come to our client's notice recently that the other three brothers

or their representatives have executed a sale deed in your favour whereby they purport to convey and you to purchase the entire premises. Our client instructs us that she has not joined in the transaction and that it was entered into without her knowledge and much less her consent and that as such the sale and the purchase can in no manner bind her or her interest in the premises, viz., the ¼ share to which our client's husband was entitled and which as detailed above has devolved on our client. You have acquired a valid title only to the shares of the executants of the sale deed.

As you are now in possession of the entire premises our client has instructed us to call upon you to give her possession of her ¼ share after dividing the property by metes and bounds or to otherwise adjust her claim within one month from the date of this notice failing which our client will be obliged to take steps for the purpose in a Court of Law and in that event will hold you responsible for all her costs.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) K. Shankaranarayan Rao,
Advocate.

.....

Reply of Government thereto, letter No.2010/C.B. 239-20-4, dated 10th May 1921.

In reply to your notice of the 7th ultimo issued on behalf of the widow of the late Mr. K.S.Doraswami Iyer, I am directed to state that Government purchased the property of the late Sir K.Seshadri Iyer known as "Kumara Park" bona fide from the surviving male members of the family on

the representation which Government had no reason to disbelieve, that the family was undivided in interest, and that ~~xxx~~ to pay off the prior mortgage and other debts of the family it was imperative and necessary to sell the property in question. As a matter of fact the heaviest of the debts discharged out of the sale amount was a mortgage debt due to Messrs. A. Narainaswami Mudaliar & Co. on the mortgage of Kumara Park and other properties.

Government are not aware that the late Mr. K.S. Doraswami Iyer was divided in interest from the other members of the joint family, or that he had made a will regarding the disposition of his Estate. Government have no reason to believe that the sale of Kumara Park was effected without the knowledge or consent of Mrs. K.S.Doraswami Iyer. Indeed, to suit her convenience and to enable her to shift into another residence Government allowed her to continue in the occupation of the property till the 20th February 1919, though the Sale Deed was executed and consideration was paid about three months before that date.

In these circumstances I am to add that Government are not prepared to divide the property into metes and bounds and to put your client in possession of her alleged one-fourth share in it.

.....

"C o p i e s."

Chief Secretary to Govt.

Bangalore City,
27th February 1922.

C.B. 151-21-16

From

K. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Advocate & High Court Vakil,

64, Balepet, Bangalore City.

To

H. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

Bangalore.

64
27/2

I have the honour to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter No. 5325/ C.B. 151-21-15 dated the 25th February, its enclosures and a separate sealed cover containing all the title-deeds relating to Kumara Park. I propose to forward to you in due course a draft written statement for approval after I prepare the same. The suit stands adjourned to the 14th March for service of summons on the remaining defendants.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Ramachandra Rao,

Advocate & High Court Vakil.

C.B. 151-21-17.
C.B. 3748.

64. Kalepet, Bangalore City
29th March, 1922.

From

Ramachandra Rao, Esq, B.A.,B.L.,
Advocate & High Court Vakil,
BANGALORE.

To

F. Nathan, Esquire, B.A.,
Chief Secretary to Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Sir, Re: O.S.No.11 of 21-22.

I have the honor to enclose herewith a fair copy of the written statement which has to be filed in the above case on the 30th instant.

The written statement has been drafted in consultation with Mr.C. Narayanaswamy Naidu.

I shall be much obliged by your kindly obtaining the signature of the Dewan to the written statement and also Vakalathnama and returning the same to me before 11 A.M., on Thursday.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. Ramachandra Rao.

Issued on

NO. 6023/CB 151-21-18 the 29th March 1922.
Encls 2.

M. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Advocate and High Court Vakil, Bangalore.

I have the honour to return herewith duly signed by the Dewan a written statement and Vakalathnama in O.S.No.11 of 21-22 of the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, in which the Dewan is the 7th Defendant.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government.

KM/CLG.

C. NARAYANASWAMY NAIDU, B.A., B.L.
HIGH COURT VAKIL & ADVOCATE
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, BANGALORE DN.

C.B. 151-21-1[illegible].

Bangalore City 21-11-1922

C.B. 1640

To
The Chief Secretary
&
The Govt of Mysore
Bangalore.

Sir

I have the honour to request you to send me immediately Sale deed or decree executed by the late Mr. K. S. Doraiswamy Iyer in favour of the Govt for purchase of his lands in Mysore about the year 1913 as they have the filed in O.S. 11/21-22. Memorandum of Damam Saheb.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
your most obedient Servant
C. Narayanaswamy Naidu
Public prosecutor

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *191*

Date of issue 1st Dec 1914

Signed by Mr. A.V. Ramanathan

Section C.B.

File No. 151-21

Serial No 20

urgent

D.O. No. 3459

To

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt

Dear Sir,

I am desired to request you to kindly send for reference the sale deed dated 20.7.13 relating to the purchase of the building site opposite the Guests' Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and his brothers which was sent to the Asst. Comptroller in charge of the State Treasury for safe custody with this Office letter no 4.5582/4.m. 344-12-33 dated 24th January 1914.

Yours Sincerely

Chief Secretary

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

C.B. 151-21-21 CB- 1754

In reply please refer to No. S.L.2300./ Enclosure Sale deed

Comptroller's Office, Bangalore,

Dated the 5th December *1922*.

Dear Sir,

As desired in your D.O. No.3459/C.B.151-21-20, dated 1st December 1922, I forward herewith the sale deed relating to the purchase of the building site opposite the Guests' Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and his brothers, the receipt of which may kindly be acknowledged.

Yours sincerely,

Br nashawendra Rao
Offg

K. Matthan Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SAM)

Two Bonds

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to———

Section C. B.
File No. 151-21
Serial No. 22

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* *19*

No. 3671 8/13/12/18

Date of issue 18/12/18

Signed by- Mr. M. V. Kandaswamy

To

The Comptroller To your

Sir,

I ~~write to~~ am directed to acknowledge the receipt of the sale deed relating to the purchase of the building site opposite the guests' quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. K. S. Doraiswamy & and his brothers forwarded with your office letter no S. L. 2300 & 5.1

I have etc

11/12

over.

for Chief Secre

Two J.O. 115

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 191 .

Date of issue 13/12/192

Signed by Mr. N.S. Ramaswamy

(in a sealed cover)

Section C. B.

File No. 15/-24

Serial No. 23

No. 3669/Secl. (Sealed Cover)
& 13-12-192

To Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A.B.L., Advocate, Bangalore
~~Mr. C. Narasimhaswamy Naidu, B.A.B.L., Public Prosecutor, Bangalore~~

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith (in a sealed cover) the sale deed relating to the purchase of the building site opposite the Guests' Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. D.S. Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers in October 1913.

In favour of an acknowledgement

P.T.O.

is requested

I have etc.

11/12

For Chief Secy

Copy to Mr. C. Narayana Swami Naidu, Public Prosecutor, Bangalore

Rep. 3670/C.S. 8/13-12-1922

By order

11/12

For Chief Secy

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

No. 2.

64, Balepet,
Bangalore City.
2nd January 1924.

1754

C.B. 1892

From

M. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Advocate and High Court Vakil,

Bangalore City.

To

C.B. 151-21-24.

The Chief Secretary to Government,

General and Revenue Secretariat,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter No. 3669/ C.B. 151-21-23 dated the 17th December 1923, and a sealed cover containing a registered sale deed dated 20th July 1917 executed by the late Mr. L.S. Doraswami Iyer and his brothers in favour of the Dewan of Mysore ~~relating~~ in respect of building sites opposite the Guards Quarters, Mysore. I propose to file the same in Court in a few days.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Ramachandra Rao

Advocate & High Court Vakil.

No [illegible].

C.B.497.
C.B.187-'21

From

K. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

and C. Narayanaswamy Naidu, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Advocates, Bangalore City.

64, Balepet,
Bangalore City.
22nd Sept.1923.

To

K. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to the Government

of Mysore, B a n g a l o r e.

Re: Original Suit No. 11 of 1921-22.

Meenakshiammal - vs - 7. The Dewan of Mysore.

Commissions returnable by 5th Nov.23.

Sir,

We have the honour to inform you that in the above suit the Court has, on the application of the plaintiff, ordered the issue of commissions for the examination of witnesses residing outside its jurisdiction. It is stated by the plaintiff that the witnesses whom she proposes to examine are residing in Madras, Tanjore, Bombay and Trichinopoly. We enclose herewith copies of the application and affidavit filed on behalf of plaintiff.

On receiving intimation as to the time when such examination will proceed, we shall have to go and cross-examine the witnesses with a view to elicit facts which would support the defence which has been filed on behalf of the 7th defendant. After the commissions are returned duly executed, - we may have to take out processes for our witnesses. All - this requires funds.

We would therefore request you to advance us a sum of Rs. 1000/- (one thousand only) to meet all the necessary

expenses. We will submit a bill after the case is decided.

We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

V. Ramachandra Rau

C. Narayanaswamy Naidu

Advocates.

In the Court of the District Judge, Bangalore.

C. S. No. 11 of 1921-22.

Plaintiff.		Defendants.
Mrs. Meenakshammal.	- vs -	K. S. Ramaswamy Iyer and others.

--

Under Order 26 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the plaintiff abovenamed most respectfully prays that, for the reasons and under the circumstances set forth in the accompanying affidavit, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to order the issue of commission for the examination of the following witnesses:-

1. To the Court of Small Causes to examine
   (a) The Hon'ble Justice C.V.Kumara Swami Sastry, High Court Judge, Madras.
   (b) Messrs. Brightwell and Moesby, Solicitors, High Court House, Madras.
   (c) E.R. Subbaraya Iyer, Retired Comptroller, Mylapore, Madras.

2. Commission to the Court of the District Judge, Tanjore to examine the following witnesses:-
   (a) V.P. Madhava Rao, Esq., C.I.E., Retired Dewan of Mysore, Tanjore.
   (b) S.P. Natesa Iyer, Village Munsiff and Taluk and District Board Member, Serukallathur, Nannilam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.
   (c) K. Saminatha son of Ramaswami Iyer, Mirasdar, Kurumanangudi, Kuvalur Post, Tanjore Dt.
   (d) Ramachandra Sastrier, son of Rama Sastriar, Mirasdar and Purohit, Kurumanangadi, Kuvalur post, Negapatam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.

(e) S. Panchapakesha Iyer, son of Subbaraya Iyer, Mirasadar Kurumanangadi Kuruvalur Post, Negapatam Taluk, Tanjore District.

(f) K.V. Subramanya Iyer, son of Venkataram Iyer, Village Munsiff, Eravamgeri Vattam Kuruvalur Post, Tanjore District.

(g) Muthu Iyer son of Aiyya Iyer Chittamallore, Adya K.K. Tanjore District.

(h) V. Subramani Iyer, son of Muthusami Iyer, Mirasadar, Melavo, Suraikayur Post, via. Peeralam, S.I.Ry.

(i) V. Narayanaswami Iyer, son of Vaidyanatha Iyer, Pleader, Mayavaram, Tanjore District.

3. To the Court of Small Causes, Bombay to examine:-

(a) Chairman, Board of Directors, The Aurangabad Mills, Victoria Buildings, Parsi Bazaar Street, Bombay to produce account books, cash books, relating to the Mills.

4. To the Court of the District Judge, Trichinopoly to examine Muthukrishna Iyer, Sub Inspector of Police, Pandamangalam, Trichinopoly District.

As there are a large number of witnesses to be examined on Commissioner, the plaintiff prays that in the first instance, a commission may be issued to examine the witnesses in Madras.

Bangalore.
May, 1923.

" copy"

In the court of the District Judge, Bangalore.

C. S. No. 11 of 1921-22.

Mrs. Meenakshammal. .. Plaintiff.

-VS-

Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer & others. . Defendant:

I, Aiyaswami Iyer, the brother of the plaintiff abovenamed hereby solemnly affirm and beg to state as follows:--

1. My sister the plaintiff has filed the above suit against the defendants for partition and share of the joint family properties and other reliefs.

2. The plaintiff has a large number of witnesses to be examined on her behalf who live outside the jurisdiction of the Mysore State, in Madras, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Bombay. The plaintiff took out summons - twice to the Madras witnesses, viz., to the Hon'ble Justice C.V. Kumaraswami Sastry and to Messrs. Brightwell and Moresby, but was unable to secure their attendance. The Hon'ble Justice C.V.Kumaraswami Sastry is a high - officer of Government who cannot attend court without detriment to public service. The other witnesses ofthe plaintiff live in different places outside the Mysore State and are not amenable to the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court and it is impossible to secure their - attendance before this Court. Even otherwise it would involve very heavy expenditure, trouble and delay to get

the witnesses over here for examination.

Under the circumstances, it is necessary in the interests of justice, that orders as prayed for in the accompanying application should be issued.

B a n g a l o r e.
28th May 1923.

" copy"

G.R..S VI G 34]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to... .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* *192*

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section C. B

File No. 151-21

Serial No.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read—

G.O. No 5165-7 / C.B. 151-21-
dated 13th Feby 1922 ordering
that the services of Mr. M.
Ramachandra Rao, B.A. B.L, Advocate
Bangalore, and Mr. C. Narayanaswa
Naidu, B.A. B.L, Public Prosecutor
Bangalore Divn be engaged for
conducting them on behalf of the
Dewan, the case filed in the Court
of Distt Judge, Bangalore, by Mrs
Meenakshi Ammal, widow of the
late Mr. K. Doraiswamy Iyer against
Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy Iyer & others
and in which the Dewan of
Mysore is included as the 4th
defendant.

Order Thereon No.

2. Letter No 219 dt 22nd Sept 23
from Messrs Ramachandra Rao & Naidu

Swamin Naidu, Advocates, stating that in the above suit the Court has, on the application of the plaintiff ordered the issue of commissions for the examination of witnesses residing outside its jurisdiction, that they will have to go and cross-examine the witnesses at the time of such examination, that they will also have to take out processes for their witnesses and requesting that for the above purposes they may be given an advance of Rs 1,000.

Order:

The Comptroller to report is requested to place at the disposal of messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao & C. Narayanaswami Naidu, Advocates, Bangalore city, an advance of Rs 1,000/- to meet the expenses in connection with the above suit, subject to adjustment on receipt of a bill after the case is decided.

Chief Secretary.

To The Comptroller to report

messrs M. Ramachandra Rao
C. Narayanaswami Naidu

mvk 27.9.22

List of enclosures.

2. The expenditure will be met from the provision of Rs 35.80 made in the current year's budget for payment of fees to Advocates and other Law charges under the head 18 - Courts of Law - 2 - Law Officers. (Page 34 of the budget)

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1858—GPB—1,000,00—21-12-21

H. To 110
19/11/23

SD 861

Special First Class Magistrate's Court,

Chikmagalur, CR 151-21-27

Dated the 19th November 23.

From

C.Narainswamy Naidu, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Special First Class Magistrate,

C h i k m a g a l u r.

To

K. Matthan Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

RE:- Meenakshmamma Vs. Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that as I told you in person I left the records in Meenakshmamma's case with Mr. D.Shama Rao B.A., L.L.B., Advocate, Bangalore City. Mr. M. Ramaswamy cannot appear for the Government as he is appearing for one of the defendants who is supporting the Plaintiff's case. In my opinion it is absolutely necessary that another advocate should be engaged to assist Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao as the case is a very important one and as the counsel will have to go to several places to examine witnesses on commission. Mr. D. Shama Rao is a competent lawyer and he can be safely entrusted with the case and I have myself entrusted him with all my private cases.

If you approve of the arrangement, Mr. Shama Rao will appear with Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao and conduct the case. Otherwise the records will be returned to you.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

C Narainswamy Naidu

Special First Class Magistrate,

C h i k m a g a l u r.

CMK.

G.R..S VI G 34]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to... ....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue.....3.....

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section C. B

File No. 15 to 21

Serial No. 22

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read—

G.O. No. 5165-7 | C.B. 15-1-21-11 dated 13th Feby 1922 engaging the services of Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore & Mr. C. Narayana Swami Naidu, public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division, for conducting on behalf of the Dewan the case filed in the Court of the District Judge, Bangalore, by Mrs. Meenakshi Ammal against Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Iyer & others in which the Dewan of Mysore is included as the 7th defendant.

~~Order Thereon No.~~

Letter no 110 A 19th Nov. 1923 from Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu Special first class magistrate, Chikmagalur reporting that Mr. M. Ramaswamy, Bar Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Divn. cannot appear for the Govt in ~~his place~~, as he is appearing for a

the defendants who are supporting the Plaintiff's case.

Order No. 1973-A/S.C.-151

Mr. C. Narayanaswamy Naidu having since been appointed as Special Magistrate

Govt direct that the service of Mr. D. Shama Rao, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Bangalore City, be engaged, in his place ~~of Mr.~~.

~~C. Narayanaswamy Naidu Transferred~~ ~~appointed as Special Magistrate~~, along with Mr. R. Ramachandra for conducting the case on behalf of the Govt.

Sd/- 13/12
for Chief Secretary.

~~Mr.~~
Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao
Mr. D. Shama Rao
The Comptroller
" Govt Advocate

Copy to Mr. C. Narayanaswamy Naidu with reference to his letter no. 110 dt 19th Nov 23.

gmt
12.12.23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1868—GPB—1,000,00—21-12-23

D. SHAMA RAO, B.A., LL.B.
ADVOCATE

BALEPET

Bangalore City 7.1.24

CRB 1184

CB 151-21-24

To

K. Matthan, Esquire, B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

In acknowledging with thanks receipt of the Government Order No. 1973-6/C.B. 151-21-28 dated the 14th December 1923 engaging my services for conducting the case, viz., O.S. No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Court, Bangalore, on behalf of the Dewan, I beg to send herewith a Vakalatnama for the signature of the Dewan. I request you to kindly obtain his signature to it and send it on to me at your earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be,
S i r ,
Your most obedient servant,

D Shama Rao

A D V O C A T E .

The accompanying Vakalat may kindly be signed & sent to me
Dewan
Enclosure not received
4/1/24

8a
71
Draft submitted
on 8.1.24. Issue
8/1

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191

Date of issue 9/1/24

Signed by Sir. C.S. Ratnaswamy Iyengar

Section C.B.

File No. 151-21.

Serial No. 30

No. 2259/C.B.

Encl

To

Mr. D. Shama Rao, B.A. B.L.
Advocate, Bangalore city

Sir

Reference ~~Letter~~ dt 4.1.24.

I am directed to return herewith the Vakalatnama duly signed by the Dewan for conducting the case O.S. no 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Court, Bangalore, on behalf of the Dewan

I have etc,

Clerk 8/1
for chief

over

Asst 8.1.24

o 10

64, Balepet,
Bangalore City.
7th February 1924.

From

M. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Advocate and High Court Vakil,

Bangalore.

CB 1342
C.S. 151-21

To

K. Matthan, Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to Government, Bangalore.

Re: District Court, Bangalore.
C.S.No. 11 of 1921-22.
Mrs. Meenakshiammal -vs- 7. The Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the plaintiff in the above case has taken out a commission for the examination of three witnesses on her behalf before Mr. K.C. Desikachar, B.A.,B.L., High Court Vakil, Madras, who has been appointed Commissioner for the purpose. I had gone to Madras once on 8th January 1924, but at the instance of the plaintiff the enquiry was put off. The enquiry is again fixed for the 16th and 17th instant and I am told by the Commissioner that it is necessary to file a fresh Vakalathnama on behalf of the 7th defendant.

I shall be much obliged by your kindly getting the enclosed Vakalathnama signed by the Dewan and returning the same to me as early as possible.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Ramachandra Rao

Advocate & High Court Vakil.

Rept
I have the honour
to return herewith, one
signed by the Dewan,
Vakalathnama and
Consultation No 16 of 1924.

From

M. RAMACHANDRA RAO, B.A., B.L.
ADVOCATE AND HIGH COURT VAKIL

RESIDENCE: No. 19, V MAIN ROAD, CHAMARAJPET
BANGALORE CITY

OFFICE CHAMBERS:
Nos. 2 & 3, 54, BALEPET, BANGALORE CITY

6th January 1926

CS-1122

9 JAN 1926
Dept. No. To 5090

Re: District Judge's Court.
O. S. No. 11 of 1921-22.
Mrs. Meenakshiammal -vs- The Dewan of Mysore.
(Mrs K S Doraiswamy Iyer)
(about-Kunnara Park)

T.G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

CS 151-4-31

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that judgment was pronounced in the above case on monday the 4th instant and that the suit has been dismissed with costs.

I have applied for copies of judgment and decree and will send the same to you as soon as they are received from Court. I hope you will kindly intimate this to the Dewan Saib as early as possible.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Ramachandra Rao

Advocate and High Court Vakil.

As the copy of judgment is not necessary as it may cost much, the copy of decree may perhaps be obtained. I had also a talk with Mr Ramachandra Rao.

Dewan. 9.1

9/1

Direct with submn. 11.1.26

G. M. S. VI—G.(32)

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 12/1/26

Signed by M. Venkatakrishna Iyengar

Section C. B.
File No. 151/2
Serial No 32

No. 2062

To

M. Ramachandra Rao Saw, B.A
Advocate, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter dt 6th inst. 26 in regard to the result of the O.S. no 11 of 1921-22 in the District Judge's Court, Bangalore (Mrs. Veerakshiamma vs the Dewan of Mysore), I am directed to state that a copy of the decree may be kindly obtained and forwarded to us early. No copy of judgment is required by us

I have

for Chief Sec

Sent to
16.1.26.

C-13-1290.

Balepet, Bangalore City.

13th February 1926.

From

Messrs. L. Ramachandra Rao, B.A., B.L., C-13 (57-25-33
Advocate and High Court Vakil,
and D. Shama Rao, B.A. B.L., Advocate,
Bangalore City.

To

F. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government, Bangalore.

Re: Original Suit No.11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division.

Mrs. Meenakshiammal -vs- 7. The Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2042/S.R. dated the 12th January 1926, we have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the decree passed by the District Judge, Bangalore Division, in the above suit.

We also beg to enclose herewith separate memos showing the expenses incurred by each of us in connection with the said suit out of the advance of Rs.1000/- sanctioned in G.O.No. 1093-4/G.S.151-21 dated the 29th September 1923 and also separate bills of fees for favour of sanction.

We wish to add that there were in all 82 hearings in court, that in addition the examination of the plaintiff was conducted at her residence by a Commissioner who sat and recorded her evidence for 12 days of five hours each and that we had also to be present in Madras on 3 occasions when some of the important witnesses in the suit were examined.

We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

L. Ramachandra Rao

D. Shama Rao

M e m o.

Showing the expenses incurred in O.S.No.11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division, on behalf of the 7th defendant.

		Credit.	Debit.
1.	Amount received by me out of Rs.1000/- as advance, sanctioned in G.O.No.1093-4/ C.E.151-21 dated the 29th September 1923.	Rs. 500- 0-0.	
2.	Amount paid for obtaining copies of depositions of some witnesses and decree on 2 annas copying ~~x~~ sheets from Court.		Rs. 54- 3-0.
3.	Amount spent for vakalathnama and for payment of batta to witnesses as mentioned in the memo of costs annexed to the decree.		Rs. 7-12-0.
4.	Three journeys to and from Madras at 1½ First Class Fares each side.		Rs. 308- 4-0.
	Total.	Rs. 500- 0-0.	Rs. 370- 3-0.

Balance on hand Rs.129-13-0.

B a n g a l o r e.
13th February 1926.

M. Ramachandra Rao

Advocate and High Court Vakil.

Balepet,
Bangalore City.

13th February 1926.

M e m o

Showing the expenses incurred in O.S. No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge of Bangalore on behalf of the 7th Defendant.

		Credit.	Debit.
1.	Amount received by me out of Rs. 1000/- as advance sanctioned in Government Order No. 1093-4 Edn. 151-21 dated the 29th September 1923.	500/-	
2.	Amount spent for Vakalatnama		0 8 0
3.	3 journeys to and fro Madras at 1½ First Class fares each side		308 4 0
		500/-	308 12 0

Balance on hand Rs. 191-4-0.

D Narasa Rao

ADVOCATE.

13.2.26

Nos. 2 & 3, Balepet,

Bangalore City. 13th February 1926.

Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A.,B.L.,

Advocate and High Court Vakil, Bangalore City.

.... The Government of Mysore ..... Dr.

S.No.	Particulars.	Amount.
1.	For conducting C.S.No.11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division, on behalf of the 7th defendant -- Dewan of Mysore.	Rs. 2000/-
	Total.	Rs. 2000/-

galore.
13-2-1926.

Contents Received.

Advocate and High Court Vakil.

Balepet,
Bangalore City,

13th Febry. 1926.

Mr. D. Shama Rao, B.A., LL.B.,
Advocate.

The Government of Mysore Dr.

No.	Particulars.	Rs.	As.	P.
1.	For conducting O.S. No. 11 of 21-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore, on behalf of the 7th Defendant (Dewan of Mysore)	2000	0	0
	Total Rupees	2000	0	0

Rupees two thousand only.

Contents received.

D Shama Rao

ADVOCATE.

13.2.26

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

2527
7-1-26

Decree under O. Rules 1 to 15
& 607 C.P.C.

In the Court of the District Judge,
Bangalore Division.

Present:- Sy. Sreenivasa Iyer, Esquire,
B.A., M.L., District Judge.

Original Suit No. 11 of 1925-26.

Plaintiff:- Mrs. Meenakshi Ammal.

- versus -

Defendants:- 1. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer,
son of Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, re-
siding at Kumara Cott, High Grounds,
Bangalore, and also at Aurangabad
Mill Buildings, Bandstand, Fort, Bombay;
2. K. Seshadri Iyer; 3. K. Kamala
Ammal; 4. K.S. Narasimhaswami Iyer;
5. K.K. Thyagaraja Iyer: Defendants
2 to 5 Sons of K.S. Krishna Iyer, of
whom the 5 minor by guardian the
first defendant: all residing at
Kumara Cott, High Grounds, Bangalore
City

City; 6. Muthulakshmi Ammal, wife of late K. V. Venkatrama Iyer, Iniman, by Court Guardian Mr. A. Ramachandra Naidu, Sheristadar, District Court, Bangalore; 7. The Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore.

Suit for (1) partition and delivery to the plaintiff of her one-fourth share in all the immoveable properties described in the plaint schedules and such other immoveable properties as may be disclosed in the course of the proceedings (2) delivery of 135 shares out of the shares owned by the family in the Aurangabad Mills, Limited, (3) accounts of Rs. 2,00,000 being the amounts of income profits and dividends

dividends realized by defendants I tab during the three years preceding the suit, (4) recovery of one lakh of rupees, being her share out of the commission paid to upadhis by the said Government in the event of the Court holding that the plaintiff is not entitled to get the fourth share out of the premises known as "Kumara Park," and (5) there be a decree in favour of plaintiff for her share of the immoveable and moveable properties from date of suit till delivery of possession.

This suit coming on this day for final disposal before [illegible] Esqr., B.A., B.L., District Judge, in the presence of

Mr. K. Shankara Narayana Rao, Advocate for the plaintiff, and of Mr. A. R. Nageswara Iyer, Advocate for defendants 1 to 5, of Mr. M. Ramaswami, Advocate for the 6th defendant, and Messrs D. Shama Rao and M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocates for the 7th defendant.

It is ordered and decreed that the plaintiff's suit be and the same hereby is dismissed, with costs, except those of the sixth defendant.—

And it is further ordered and decreed that the plaintiff do pay to defendants 1 to 5 and to the 7th defendant, respectively, the sum of Rupees

(1217-14-0)

(1217-11-0) one thousand two hundred and seventeen and annas eleven only and Rupees (1009-12-0) one thousand and nine and annas twelve only, being the amount of costs incurred by them in this suit, as by a memorandum annexed, with interest thereon at six per cent per annum from this date until the date of realization.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 4th day of January 1926.

(Signed) Sreenivasa Iyer,
District Judge.

Memorandum of costs incurred in this suit.

Court fee on plaint. 3000-0-0. By the Plaintiff. By the Defendants.

" Applications. 5-8-0. 7-0-0. 1-8-0.

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

Court fee on Vakalats. — 8-0. 0-3-0. 8-0.

— " — Exhibits. — 9-8-0. —

Service of Processes. 25-0-0. 7-0-0. 1-12-0.

Total Registration and Money order Charges. 10-8-0. 9-6-0. —

Interpreters fee Witnesses 149-0-0. 58-0-0. 6-0-0.

Commissioner's fee. 400-0-0. 120-0-0. —

Cost of adjournment. — — —

Guardian's fees. 500-0-0. — —

Fees for copying, &c, &c, — 6-5-0. —

Pleaders fee. 1,000-0-0. 1,000-0-0. 1,000-0-0.

Total Rupees. 5,090-8-0. 1,217-11-0. 100 1/2-0.

Signed, Expressions Dyer,

District Judge,

Kolar, the 11th March.

568

" True Copy "

Head Record Keeper, &c

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to ~~appear on the~~	Applicant ~~appeared~~ on the	~~Copying inspector~~ ~~want of~~ copy~~ing~~ ~~sheets~~ on the	~~Additional copying sheets supplied~~ on the
[illegible]	[illegible]	1/2/26	8/2/26	8/2

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by
2-26	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TWO ANNAS

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

7

In the Court of the District Judge,

Bangalore Division.

Original Suit No. 11 of 1921-1922.

Plaintiff:- Mrs. Meenakshi Ammal.

-versus-

Defendants:- Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Iyer and others.

Schedule of the properties to be partitioned.

Description of Property.	Extent	Value for the purpose of Court-fees	Value of plaintiff's 1/4 share.
1. The Bungalow, Buildings, outhouses, &c., with the garden known as Kumara Park, situated in Seshadripuram, High ground, Bangalore, about 1 acres in extent, bearing municipal No. 19, and bounded on the North by Mr. B. L. Nias Bungalow, East by the private road, South			

TWO ANNAS
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

South by the Bungalow
known as Kumara Cot,
West by the Dharmaraja
Kadhi Feeder Channel, 4,00,000 c.f. 1,00,000 c.f.
& The Bungalow with
Outbuildings and outhouses,
with its garden and grounds
known as Kumara Cot,
situated in Crescent Road,
High Ground, Bangalore,
bearing Municipal No. 10,
and bounded on the
North by the garden forming
part of Kumara Park,
East by Public Road,
South by [illegible]
[illegible] garden [illegible] part
of this Bungalow known

as

as Datam Bhagavan, West
by Madras and Southern
Mahratta Broad Gauge
Railway Line and Ban
Bhavan Compound. 32,000 sq. ft.

3. The Bungalow with
outhouses and adjoining
Garden and grounds, known
as Rama Villa, situated
in Crescent Road, Bangalore
(as per ground) bearing Munic-
ipal No. 3, and bound on the
North by Waste Land,
East by Mr. D. Ramaswami
(separated by compound)
and Compound,
South by the Crescent Road,
West by the Public Road

This

TWO ANNAS

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

(This Bungalow is at present
in occupation of the plaintiff. 2,000-0-0 5,000-0-0
4. 9 vacant sites at Devha-
-dipuram, with trees, &c.,
standing thereon, about 1
acre in extent, bearing
Municipal Numbers 8 to 16,
and bounded on the North
by Mr. T. Govinda Rao's garden,
Easterly Channel, South by
Cross Road, Westerly Main Road. 2,000-0-0. 500-0-0.
5. The Bungalow (at
present in the occu-
pation of Mrs. Viswana-
-thadyer) with the other
out-houses and ground
situated in the 6th Main
Road, Malleswaram, Bangalore,
the said

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣ್ಣೆ

bearing municipal numbers
380 and 381, and bounded on
the North by 11th Cross Road,
East by another Cross Road,
South by Byagari house and
compound, West by No 8,
Main Road, Mallewaram ... 32,000-0-0 ... 8,000-0-0

6. The Bungalow with outhouses,
garden and grounds situated
in Mallewaram, Bangalore,
(at present occupied by
Srimati Seria Ammani Ammal,
alias Ananthan Lakshmi Ammal),
bounded on the North by No 7 C. P. Ma-
dhava Rao's house and garden, East
by No 8, Main Road, South by 11th
Cross Road, West by No 5 of main
Road, ... 16,000-0-0 ... 4,000-0-0

Deleted

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

12

Schedule No. B. Properties situate

Mysore District, Mysore Taluk, Kukka

of "Dewan's Garden", now in the name

Serial No.	Name of Village and Hobli	details as to dry, gar. &c.	S. No.	Extent			Assessment.	
				A.	G.	M.	Rs.	A.
1.	Kukkarahalli	Dry	27	1	17		1	8
		Dry	28	1	25		1	8
	"Dewan's Garden"	~~Dry~~	~~29~~	4	~~15~~		4	8
		Dry	~~30~~	4	23		5	.
	comprising	Dry	31 ~~30~~	3	9		3	8
		Garden	32	1	13		2	.
	Cocoanut,	Do	33	5	8		8	.
		Dry	36	2	3		3	8
	Mango, and	Garden dry	57	11	20		18	.
	such trees,	Do	58	11	28		22	.
		Dry	59	~~10~~	23		.	12
	Khata No. 15.	Dry	60	~~5~~	23		6	.
		Kharab	1-62	7	.		6	3
		57-59 & 60.					~~5~~ 7	
		District Fund.		.	.		5	7
		Railway, &c.		.	.		1	5
				60	7	*	38	14

* The discrepancy of 0-5-8 is due to the deduc

portion of the District Fund and Railway

NAS

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

13

Mysore -

Ni Village, goes under the name

Nadu R. C. Ramaswami Iyer

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣಿ

14-

Schedule C. List of Properties situated

1. Six Malas (mountains or large hills co
named as follows:- 1. Punchakalli, 2. Vatte
4. Erattamaan, 5. Parapakkalli, 6. Vatta
called as North Nalamala). These 8
to the South of Kunnapuya and Ch
to the North Kosa Kuya,
to the West of Anekal and Cholap
to the East of Kunnapuya.—
6 Hills North Kottamala in situat
Parajan Thodu, to the North of Tell
of Eppalwayur, to the West of Kuzo
Venad of the Zamorin, and to the East
All six situated in the Vilo
Kovali, Iyernad Taluk, Malabar Dr
Note:- The ~~family~~ Kaupacharlu (2 nos) ~~family's~~ pa
property and the other one-fourth belongs to

NAS

MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

Malabar District.

	Value for purposes of Court Fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's ¼ share therein
with parcels), and		
, B. Kumpoompaaru,		
ara otherwise		
Tellicherry Coundadaw,		
a Bhadra		
and Maria Rowmulu,		
the wife		
Mala, and Jesu		
the Mala and the		
Pengottu Mala		
Nayar, Pandur		
members of this		
ily of first Plaintiff		

Nyar

TWO ANNAS
GOVT OF MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

(iii) Areacode Estate, consisting of
Sannikode Amson, Calicut Taluk, bo
bounded on the East by the
Vadavaiery Thaadumilam Elyadi
-dambalam Ramapoyal, and
Nedupparamba Chellupara to
Nemani Payil — Thalapulal
Note:- The Rangaswamy Iyen
of the property and the other
the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer's.
The Value of the interests o
the parties in the aforesaid
Schedule C(b). Malabar Distr
Village, No. 345, Kunnarapuram Seshadri

Name and Number of Village.	Names of plots.	Details, as dry or wet.
Kollenagoodu, otherwise	Pillaikudu.	Permanent dry.

MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

17

...ds, situat in the

... District, and

... Taro, West by

... with by Kau=

... with by

... Kaudaun

...,

... as one half

... belong to

the family of

... ater. ~~Rs. 80,000~~ ~~Rs. 20,000~~

... Gulaghat Taluk, Kilar Kathavai

... Nadamuny Iyer, Dy. Thasildar's

Rs. Dr. 37/K-03.—

Extent.		Assess-ment.		Value for purposes of Court fee of the entire property.		Value of Plaintiff's 1/4 share therein.	
A.	cts.	Rs.	As.	Rs.	As.	Rs.	As.
1	0	0	12				

otherwise Known as Killak Kattarai		
	Pillai Kudu.	Wetland.
	256/11	0-4-0 0-2-0
	— do —	Puramboke.

			61		10						
			14		2						
			11		2						
			7		2						
			7		1						
			22		4						
			2		1						
			2		1						
		3	45	3	7						
		1	24	3	12						
			86	5	6						
			77	6							
			78	7	2						
	7	7	37	46	2						
			4	8	3						
		1	47	3							
			18	3	9						
			22		11						
			61	Jaunk							
			7	Wandis							
			10	Plantain							
			2	—	8½						
			6	—	8½						
			6	Jaunk							
		5	86	57	7		447	13		111	14 3

TWO ANNAS
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

Schedule No. C (c) — Malabar District

Mangalam Village, Owner K. Dara

Name and No. of Village.	Name of locality.	Details as dry or wet.
No. 94, Mangalam.	Semmangapadam.	Wet.
	~~Dryland gardens.~~	Dry land gardens
	Kallamparambu.	Gardens
		Dry land
	Kalandhirutte Kallaparambu.	Gardens
	Nilamana	Wet.
	Semmagnapadam Kallaparambu	Dry.

NNAS

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

2/

...xecutat Taluk, Mangalam Vattam.

...ci Iyer, Vca, ...of Sirik, Sarkaradi Iyer.

	extent.		Assessment.			Value for purposes of court fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's 1 share 4 therein
	A.	sto.	Rs.	As.	P.		
1/1	5	85	17	9	.		
/3	.	50	1	8	.		
/4	.	10	.	5	.		
4/1	11	59	58	.	.		
/2	.	12	.	8	.		
3	.	18	.	6	.		
/4	.	7	.	1	.		
	.	9	Waste.				
	8	.	do				
69/1	.	70	1	6	.		
	.	44	1	5	.		
/3	.	32	Waste.				
9/1	1	10	3	5	.		

	Thindarkadan.	Dryp.
	Kallaparambu.	
	Parzhapallamad	Dryp.
	Parambu.	

Schedule C.(d) — Malabar District

No. 87. Pattadar K. Doraswamy Iyer, &c.

Vattam.	Name of Plot.	Dryor Wet.
No. 25, Kottai-	Paminadam.	Wet.
-kadu Village,	Paminadai.	Wet Waste.
	Valaithukadu.	Waste.
	—Do—	Waste.
	Paminalahari Do.	Waste.
	Paminadam Paramboke.	Do
	—Do—	—Do—
	—Do—	—Do—

9/8	1	14	Waste.			
1, 2	4	98				
	35	8	84	5	421-9-0.	105-6-3.

20. Palghat Taluk, Kattaikadu Vattam

1. Kuttadi dyam,

	Extent		Assessment		Value for pur- poses of Court fee of the entire of the property.	Value of plaintiff's 1/4 share therein
	A.	Cts.	Rs	As. P.		
321	1	28	45	13.		
9		35				
11	1	59				
2	2	48				
324	1	40				
340	1	40				
4/6	8	37				
	30	87	45	13	229-1-0	107-4-3.

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

24

(e) Malabar District, Palghat Taluk Kumaraxp

No 66, Puthur Vattom, Kumarapuram Village.	(1) of No 68, Puramboke Pieces,	Piéces Acres d
	(2) of No	d
	(3) — of No	d

* Bounded on the East by the Vydyanathaswami house

on the West by the Ramaswami's house, and on the

Schedule D. moveables.

540 shares of Rs. 1,000/- each in the Nizam's Dominions. The plaintiff's family owns more shares. But the elicited from the defendants, as share in such extra shares for given her.

(Signed)

/true

Head Re

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
INAS
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

~~Puttur Vattamma K. Doraiswamy Iyer, son of~~
Sir K. Seshadri Iyer,

~~800~~	Vacant ground,	20-0-0	5-0-0
302	small house with back yard &c	750-0-0	187-8-0
~~03~~	Big house, ~~do~~	~~2000~~ 0-0	500-0-0

~~North by~~ Lake Lakshminarayana Agrahara Temple property,
~~by the~~ Public Street, Bezanta Durai Mudaliar's
with its fixtures and fronts.

	Value for purpose of Court fee of the entire property.	Value of Plaintiff's ¼ share therein
~~Spinning~~ Mills, Limited,		
~~and that the~~		
~~shall be to be~~		
~~Executive~~		
~~to be~~		
	Rs. 5,40,000-0-0	1,35,000-0-0

~~Venkatasa~~ Iyer,

District Judge.

Copy applied for by ~~on the~~	Applicant told to ~~appear on the~~	Applicant ~~appeared~~ on the	~~Copying stopped~~ ~~want of~~ copy sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the
Shri R. Rao. on 6/1/26	Secretary on 30/1/26 6/2/26 ~~3/2/26~~ 8/2/26	1-2-26 Accd. 3/2/26	8/2/26	3/2

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by
5-2-26	5-2-26		

Immediate

D.O. No. 2206
CB

Dy 10/3/26

Dear Sir

With reference to your letter
R 13th Feby 26 forwarding
Sundry Bills your
bill of fees for conducting O.S.
No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of
the District Judge, Bangalore Dist,
(Mrs. Laxmanarasheramma vs T. Ramaiah
Dewan of Mysore), I write
to request you to kindly see
me in office at any time
convenient to you tomorrow, as
I wish to have a talk with
you in the matter.

The favour of a line
in reply is requested.

Yours sincerely,

M.D.

To. Ramachandra Rao Saw, B.A.B.L.
Advocate.

hm
10/3/26.

Mr. Ramachandra Rao
Has been seen
in my office

R
11/3/26

Mr. Ramachandra Rao
has been seen in my office
R
25/3/26

Draft sent.

App.F.VI-GL.]

B650

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 27/3/26

Signed by Hon. P. G. D'Souza

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Section CB.

File No.

Serial No.

D.O No. 2607/CB

To

D. Shamaraya Rao Esqr. B.A.B.L.

Advocate Bellary

Bangalore City

Dear Sir

With reference to your letter dated 13th Feby 1926 forwarding your fee stamps for Executing O.S.No.11 of 1921-22 on the file of the Dist Judge Bangalore Dn. (Mrs Meenakshiammal Vs the Deccan Mysore) I write to request you to kindly see me in Office at any time convenient to you on Wednesday the 31st instant.

Yours Sincerely.

D

To D. Shamaraya Rao Esqr. B.A.B.L.

Advocate over

B

Proceedings of the Government of H. H.
the Maharaja of Mysore

* * * *

Read:--

Letter dated 13th February 1926 from Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A.,B.L., and D. Shama Rao, B.A., B.L., Advocates, Bangalore City, forwarding a copy of the decree passed by the District Judge, Bangalore Division in Original Suit No.11 of 1921-22 - Meenakshiammal Vs. Dewan of Mysore and furnishing accounts of the expenditure incurred out of the advance of Rs.1,000/- placed with them and also bills on account of their fees, amounting to Rs.2,000/- each.

(signed)
Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar

O R D E R No. 2759-60/EB. 151-21-34

Dated, Bangalore, the 17th April 1926.

Government are pleased to sanction a fee of Rs.750/- to Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao and Rs.250/- to Mr. D. Shama Rao for having conducted the case on behalf of Government.

The expenditure incurred in connection with the case, by Messrs. Ramachandra Rao and D. Shama Rao amounting to Rs.370-3-0 and Rs.308-12-0 respectively, as per particulars contained in the memos attached is also sanctioned.

The Comptroller is requested to arrange for the payment of the amounts sanctioned to the Advocates after adjusting the advance of Rs.1000/- sanctioned in the Govern-

ment Order of 29th September 1925.

Chief Secretary to Govt.

To

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

Messrs.M.Ramachendra Rao, B.A., B.L.,

& D. Shama Rao, B.A., B.L.,

Advocates, Bangalore.

****

No: 2761/

Copy to L. & L. Secretary, with compliments.

MRN.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS FORWARDED.

---:o:O:o:---

1. Sale Deed dated May 1st, 1886, executed by Channaborappanavara Andanappa, in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

2. Sale Deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Krishnappa and his brother's son Munisamappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

3. Sale Deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Boranayka, son of Giddappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

4. Sale Deed dated May 16th, 1886, executed by Mallikarjunappa, son of Yentaganahalli Kappanna, in favor of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

5. Sale Deed dated May 31st, 1886, executed by Yellamma, wife of Nangundahalli Channappa in favor of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

6. Sale Deed dated June 21st, 1886, executed by Mareppa in favor of Mr. Sheshadri Iyer.

7. Sale Deed dated March 23rd 1887, executed by Mariappa in favour of Mr. K. Sheshadri Iyer.

8. Sale Deed dated April 4th, 1887, executed by Nagondahalli Channappa's wife Yellamma and her son Narayani in favour of Mr. K. Sheshadri Iyer.

(a) Sale Deed dated February 10th, 1876, executed by Huvinarangamma in favour of Munisamappa.

(b) Sale Deed dated July 25th, 1878, executed by Munisamappa in favor of Narasimhanna.

(c) Court Certificate issued by the First Division Munsiff, Bangalore, in favour of Narasimhanna dated the 23rd February 1883.

(d) Sale Deed dated March 24th, 1883, executed by Narasimhanna in favour of Muniappa.

9. Sale deed dated 4th April 1887, executed by Muganna and his sons Muniappa and Channappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

10. Sale Deed dated April 14th 1887, executed by Uddanappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

11. Sale Deed dated July 30th, 1887, executed by Kunchigaradyava and his son Narasimhanna in favour of Mr. K. Sheshadri Iyer.

12. Sale Deed dated August 19th, 1887, executed by (1) Chinnaiya, (2) Doddaiya, (3) Munisamy in favour of Mr. K. Sheshadri Iyer.

13. Sale Deed dated December 11th 1887, executed by Venkamma wife of Venkataramaiya in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

(a) Deed of Mortgage dated November 8th 1849 executed by Sunkada Appajappa in favour of Jangamakote Srinivasa Rao.

(b) Receipt dated 8th November 1849 given by Sunkada Appajappa in favour of Jangamakote Srinivasa Rao.

14. Sale Deed dated 11th April 1888 executed by Seshagiriappa in favour of Mr. K. Sheshadri Iyer.

15. Sale deed dated 23rd May 1888, executed by Mysore Narayana Rao in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

16.(a) Sale Deed dated 22nd March 1871, executed by Nanjunda Bhatta in favour of Krishnappa

15 (b) Sale Deed dated 26th August 1885 executed by Krishnaji and his son Mavaji in favour of Mr. Narayan Rao.

16. Sale Deed dated the 21st November 1918 executed by Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer and four other in favour of the Dewan of Mysore.

17. Power of Attorney dated 16th November 1918 given by Messrs. K.V.Venkataramaiyer alias Venkatram V. Seshadri and K. Subramania Iyer alias Subramania K. Seshadri in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

18. Copy of Power of Attorney dated 27th June 1917, given by Mr. A.M.Sundara Murthi Mudaliar and four others in favour of Mr. D. Raghavachar, B.A., B.L., Advocate.

19. Copy of Mortgage Deed dated 31st December 1903 executed by Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and four others in favour of Messrs. A. Narrainsami Mudaliar & Co., Mysore Hall, Bangalore.

20. Copy of reconveyance dated 21st November 1918, executed by Messrs. A. Narrainsami Mudaliar & Co., through their representative Mr. D. Raghavachar in favour of Messrs. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer and C. Srikanteswara Aiyar.

A. R. NAGESVARA IYER, B. A., B. L.,
ADVOCATE.
ಎ. ಆರ್. ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ಐಯ್ಯರ್, ಬಿ. ಎ., ಬಿ. ಎಲ್.,
ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್,
ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಪೇಟೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

CHICKPET,

Bangalore City...9th March.....192

C.B. 3188

C B
12/3/31

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

I am returning herewith the following documents which had been produced by Government before the District Judge of Bangalore in Original Suit No. 11 of 21 - 22. Please acknowledge receipt of the same and oblige.

Yours sincerely,

A. R. Nageswara Iyer

List of documents:-

1. File No. 126 - 17
2. Registered sale deed of Kumara Park, dated 21st November 1918 (this I understand was taken from the Comptroller's iron safe.)
3. Letter dated 29th November 1918 from Mr. K.S.Ramaswami Iyer to the Executive Engineer.
4. Letter dated 21st February 1919 from Mr.K.S.Ramaswami Iyer to the Chief Enginner.

5. Land Revenue File Register 1907 - 08. Nos. 101 - 300.

6. File Register. Volume IV. 1916 - 17. Nos. 101 - 300.

(Six documents.)

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

T

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

To

.....

Date of issue.....

Dear Sir,

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of the Marginally noted documents forwarded with your letter Dy 9th March 1931.

Yours Sincerely

Ray 31.3.31

For Chief Secy to Govt

Signed by.....

(1) File No 126 – 17

(2) Registered Sale deed of Kumara pande, Dy 21.11.1918 Marg "Y"

(3) Letter Dy 29.11.1918 from Mr K.S. Ramaswamy Iyer to the Executive Engineer Marg X

(4) Letter Dy 21.2.1919 from Mr K.S. Ramaswamy Iyer to the Chief Engineer Marg "Z"

List of enclosures.....

(5) Land Revenue File Nevili 1907-08 Nos 1 to 20

(6) File Nevili, Vol IV 1916-17 Nos 161 to 170

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

A.R. Nageswara Iyer Esq B.A.B.L.
Advocate. Chittoor.

B. Lucate.

[over

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

3825/C.B.

2nd April 1931.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to acknowledge the receipt of the marginally noted documents, forwarded with your letter dated 9th March 1931.

1. File No. 126-17.
2. Registered Sale deed of Cumara Park dated 21st November 1918.
3. Letter dated 29th November 1918 from Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer to the Executive Engineer.
4. Letter dated 21st Febry. 1919 from Mr. K.S.Ramaswami Iyer to the Chief Engineer.
5. Land Revenue File Register 1907-08 Nos.100-200.
6. File Register, Vol.IV 1916-17 Nos. 101-200.

Yours sincerely,
for R. A. Narasimha Iyengar.

To

A.R. Nageswara Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Advocate, Chickpet, Bangalore City.

4444/C.B

Encl 9/4/1931

Dear Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.3875/C.B dated 22nd April 1931 acknowledging receipt of certain documents sent by you, which had been produced before the District Judge, of Bangalore in Original Suit No. 11 of 21-22 I am desired to ~~forward herewith copies of two letters with which~~ state that a number of documents were sent to the address of Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao ~~who was then representing Government~~ in connection with the case referred to (Vide copies of letters enclosed). Of these documents only one, viz., the registered sale deed dated 21st November 1918 has been returned with your letter dated 9th March 1931. ~~Government will be glad if you can~~ Govt. will be glad if you can kindly give any further ~~kindly let me know~~ information regarding the whereabouts of the remaining documents referred to in the two letters addressed to Mr. Ramachandra Rao.

Yours sincerely,

13/5/31.

To

A.R.Nageswara Iyer, Esq.,B.A.,B.L.,
Advocate, Bangalore City.

4457/C.B
Encl 3 D 21/5/31

Dear Sir,

Mr. A.R. Nageswara Iyer, Advocate, has returned the ~~undermentioned~~ marginally noted documents which

1. File No. 126-17.	* had been
2. Registered Sale deed of Kumara Park dated 21st November 1918.	* produced
3. Letter dated 29th November 1918 from Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer to the Executive Engineer.	* before the
4. Letter dated 21st February 1919 from Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer to the Chief Engineer.	* District
5. Land Revenue File Register 1907-08 Nos.100-200.	* Judge of
6. File Register, Vol. IV, 1916-17 Nos. 101-200.	* Bangalore i
	* Original
	* Suit No.11
	of 1921-22

(Mrs. Meenakshiammal Vs 7 Dewan of Mysore).

2. I enclose for your ready reference copies of two letters with which a number of documents were sent to you in 1922 in connection with the above case. Of the documents referred to in these letters, only the registered sale deed of Kumara Park dated 21st November 1918 appears to have been returned as above. Government will be glad if you can kindly give any information as to the whereabouts of the remaining documents

3. A copy of letter addressed to Mr. A.R. Nageswara Iyer is also enclosed for your information.

Yours sincerely,

13/5/31

To

M.Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Govt.Advocate in Mysore.

D. O. No. 16
Rec. 20/8

CB 624

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,
Bangalore, 18th August 1931.

Dear Sir,

I am returning herewith the Sale Deed dated the 20th July 1913, executed by Messrs. K. Doraswami Iyer & others, in favour of the Government of Mysore, (which had been filed as an Exhibit in Original Suit No. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division) and request that the receipt of the same may be kindly acknowledged.

Yours sincerely,

RR 19/8/31

R. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Offg. Chief Secretary to the Govt.
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to Acknowledge the receipt of the Sale deed Dt 26-7-1913 Executed by the late Mr K Sivaswamy Iyer and others forwarded with Your D-O. letter No 16 Dt 18-8-31.

Yours Sincerely

To

A.R. Nageswara Iyer Esq
Govt Advocate

Dear Mr Ramachandra Rao.

Please refer to this Office letter No 4425/CB. 27 21.5.1931 requesting to be favoured with information as to the whereabouts of certain documents which had been produced before the District ~~Magistrate~~ Judge Bangalore in original Suit No of 1921-22 (Sem Meenakshamma Vs Dewan of Mysore)

May I request you to kindly let me know as to when the information can be furnished

Yours Sincerely

M Ramachandra Rao Esq
Judge High Court

19th December 1918

2014 CS
Encl

I am desired to forward herewith two sale deeds as per list appended and to request that arrangements may kindly be made for their safe-custody in the State Huzur Treasury. The receipt of the documents may be kindly acknowledged.

Y S
B

List.

Registered Sale Deed dated 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Govt. of the site opposite the Indian Guests' Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr.K.Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers. (6)

Registered Sale Deed dated 21.11.13 relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park", Bangalore, executed by Mr. K.Ramaswami Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore. (7)

To

M. Viraraja Urs, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Comptroller to Government.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
STATE LOAN SECTION,

Acktt. No. 1889.

Bangalore, dated 19.12.1938.

Has the honour to acknowledge receipt of his letter No Do No 2016 C.B. dated 19 December 1938 instant with contents as stated therein viz Two Sale Deeds relating to Site opposite the Indian Guests' Quarters Mysore and "Kumara Park" Bangalore respectively. TRC.

For *Assistant Comptroller.*

COM181R.2,000.21.7-38

GOVT. SERVICE

[The name and address of the addressee and the signature of sender to be written on this side.]



To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of
Mysore Bangalore

TRS Rao
Despatcher
Comptt. Mail Office
BANGALORE

I

2384/CB 5724/1/39
Encl. 3

Dear Sir,

As you are aware that in connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, you conducted the case on behalf of Government in O.S. No.11 of 1921-22 (Mrs. Meenakshiammal Vs. 7.Dewan of Mysore) on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division, Of the documents sent to you in 1922 (vide copies of Chief Secretary's letter No. 5325/CB. 151-21-15 dated 25.2.1922 and No.3669/CB. dated 13.12.1922 enclosed.) in connection with the above case, only the marginally noted registered sale deeds were returned to Govt. in May 1931. An enquiry was made of you subsequently in his office D.O. letter dated 21st May 1931 regarding the whereabouts of the remaining documents but it did not elicit any reply. I am to request you to kindly intimate where the documents in question are and whether they have been returned to you by the District Judge's Court or not.

151-21-23

1. Sale deed d. 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Govt. of the lands opposite the I.G.Qrs, Mysore executed by the late Mr. K. Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers

2. Sale deed d. 21.11.16 relating to the purchase of "Kemmara Park" Mysore executed by Mr. K. Doraswamy Iyer and family of Mysore.

The favour of a very early reply is requested.

Yours sincerely,

MS
23/1

M. Ramachandra Rao, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Mysore
Bangalore.

11

2385/C-3 5741/1/39

(1)

Dear Sir,

In connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, certain documents as noted in the statement appended had been produced before the District Judge of Bangalore in O.S.No.11 of 1921-22 (Mrs. Meenakshiammal Vs. (7) Dewan of Mysore) by Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, who conducted the case on behalf of Govt. Of the documents, only the marginally noted two registered sale deeds were returned to Government in May 1931 by Mr. A.R.Nageswara Iyer. I am to request you to kindly intimate whether the remaining documents have also been returned to Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao or to any other person and if not where they are.

Fx
Vide draft No I

The favour of an early reply is requested.

Yours sincerely,

23/1

Chief Secretary.

T o

The District Judge,

Bangalore.

23rd January 1939

1384/C3

As you are aware that in connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, you conducted the case on behalf of Government in O.S. No.11 of 1921-22 (Mrs. Meenakshiammal Vs. 7 Dewan of Mysore) on the file of the District Judge, Bangalore Division. Of the documents sent to you in 1922 (vide copies of Chief Secretary's letters No.5325/C.B.151-21-15 dated 25th February 1922 and No.3669/C.B.151-21-23 dated 13th December 1922 enclosed) in connection with the above case, only the marginally noted registered sale deeds were returned to Government in May 1931. An enquiry was made of you subsequently in this office D. letter dated 21st May 1931 regarding the whereabouts of the remaining documents but it did not elicit any reply. I am to request you to kindly intimate where the documents in question are and whether they have been returned to you by the District Judge's Court or not

1. Sale deed dated 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Government of the site opposite to the Indian Guests Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr.K.Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers.

2. Sale deed dated 21.11.1918 relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park", Bangalore, executed by Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore.

The favour of a very early reply is requested.

M

M. Ramachandra Rao, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Bangalore.

~~23rd~~ January 1939

In connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, certain documents as noted in the statement appended had been produced before the District Judge of Bangalore in O.S. No.11 of 1921-22 (Mrs. Meenakshiammal Vs. 7 Dewan of Mysore) by Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, who conducted the case on behalf of Government. Of the documents, only the marginally noted two registered sale deeds were returned to Government in May 1931 by Mr. A.R.Nageswara Iyer. I am to request you to kindly intimate whether the remaining documents have also been returned to Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao or to any other person and if not where they are.

1. Sale deed dated 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Government of the site opposite to the Indian Guests Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. K.Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers.
2. Sale deed dated 21.11.1918 relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park", Bangalore, executed by Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore.

The favour of an early reply is requested.

To

The District Judge,

Bangalore.

C 5176

M. RAMACHANDRA RAO B.A., B.L.,
ADVOCATE.

Chamarajpet,
Bangalore City.
6th March 1939.

C.B. 7/3/39 Dear Sir,

anuary

D.O.No. 11/28-39

C 5141D

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,
BANGALORE DIVISION,

Bangalore, dated... 31st January 1939.

C.B. 7/3

Dear Sir,

nclosed
gin of
that the
led in --
District
nediately

lection
s in my
e.

With reference to your D.O. letter No. 2385/C.B., dated 24th January 1939, ascertaining if the documents referred to in the list appended to your D.O. letter have been returned to Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao who conducted the case on behalf of the Government in O.S. 11 of 1921-22 on the file of this Court, I write to state that from the list of documents filed in the case it is seen that only one document viz., a sale deed dated 20th July 1913 executed by Mr. K.S. Doraswami Iyer was filed by the advocate on behalf of the 7th defendant and was marked as Exhibit 35 in the case and that no other documents were filed on behalf of the Government.

On a return application filed on 11th August 1931 the sale deed marked as Exhibit 35

was

was returned to Mr. A. R. Nageswara Iyer who was then the Government Advocate.

Yours sincerely

S. Venkatarangaiyangar

Rajasevaprasaktha

B.T. Kesavaiengar, Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to the

Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

C 3746

M. RAMACHANDRA RAO B.A., B.L.,
ADVOCATE.

Chamarajpet,
Bangalore City.
6th March 1939.

C.S. No. 6/3/39

Dear Sir,

I received your D.O.NO.2384/C.B dated the 4th January 1939 some time ago.

I recollect that, out of the list of documents enclosed with your letter, only two documents noted in the margin of your letter were exhibited in O.S.NO.11 of 1921-22, that the rest of the documents, not being exhibited though filed in -- court in a sealed cover, were returned to me by the District Court in August 1926 and that I returned the same immediately to Government.

In order to make myself sure of the above recollection I took time, made a thorough search for the documents in my office and did not find any of them remaining with me.

Yours Sincerely,
M. Ramachandra Rao

Rajasevaprasaktha

B.T. Kesavaiengar Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

General & Revenue Secretariat,

BANGALORE.

13th March 1939.

2909/ CA

Dear Sir,

I am desired to request you to kindly send for reference the sale deeds relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park" and of the building site opposite the Guests' Quarters, Mysore, which were sent to you for safe custody with Chief Secretary's D. O. letter No.2016/C.B. dated 19th December 1938.

Yours sincerely,

13.3

M. Viraraja Urs, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Comptroller to Government.

1889 ✓ 2124/SC

C.B 1744

OFFICE OF THE
COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Bangalore 24. 3 1939.

CB/S.L. Two documents.

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore
Bangalore

THE TAMIL NADU 24 MAR 1939 GOVT. OF MYSORE

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith the documents noted below as requested in your C.B. Do. No. 2909, dated 13. 3 1939.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

1) Registered Sale Deed dated 20.7.1912. relating to the purchase by Govt of the Site opposite the Indian Guests' Quarters Mysore.

2) Registered Sale deed dated 21.11.18 relating to the Purchase of "Kumara Park" Bangalore.

TR/ 24.3.39

3450/CB
Rem 1

8th April 1939

Dear Mr. Ramaswami

In connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir V. Seshadri Iyer, the sale deed and other documents pertaining to the purchase of Kumara Park (as per list enclosed) were sent to Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, who conducted the case on behalf of Government. Of these documents, only one, viz., sale deed dated 21st November 1918 executed by Mr. T. S. Ramaswamy Iyer in favour of the Dewan of Mysore, was returned to Government in May 1931 and it is now ascertained that the remaining documents are not forthcoming. I am desired to request that copies of such of these documents which have been registered may kindly be caused to be prepared and sent to Government as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. V. Ramaswami, Esqr., M.A., B.L.,
Inspector General of Registration in Mysore.

3700/C3
Encl. 7 8/4/39

My dear Ramaswami,

In connection with the litigation relating to the estate of the late Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, the sale deed and other documents pertaining to the purchase of Kumara Park (as per list enclosed) were sent to Mr M. Ramachandra Rao, Advocate, Bangalore, who conducted the case on behalf of Govt. Of these documents, only one, viz., sale deed dated 21.11.1918 executed by Mr. K.S. Ramaswamy Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore, was returned to Govt. in May 1931 and it is now ascertained that the remaining documents are not forthcoming. I am desired to request that copies of such of these documents which have been registered may kindly be caused to be prepared and sent to Govt. as early as possible.

P.T.O.

Yours sincerely

MS
7.4.39

M.V. Ramaswami Esqr. M.A., B.L.

Inspector General of Registration

in Mysore.

D.O. No. 20/Rev. 38-39

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF REGISTRATION IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, the 23rd May 1939.

Dear Mr.Kesavaiengar,

With reference to your D.O. No.3206/C.B. dated 8th April 1939 forwarding a list of documents relating to the purchase of Kumara Park and requesting that copies of such documents as have been registered may be got prepared and sent, I write to state that the District Registrar, Bangalore District, who was requested to get the copies prepared and to send them to this office has sent the accompanying 12 copies prepared in the Office of the Sub Registrar, Bangalore City, together with the Report of the Sub Registrar, in the matter.

From the Sub Registrar's report, it is found that the other documents could not be traced and that if further particulars about them are furnished he will search for them again. If any further particulars are available they may kindly be sent so that another search may be got made.

Yours sincerely,

To

Rajasevaprasaktha

B. T. Kesavaiengar, B. A.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

BANGALORE.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS FORWARDED:

1. Sale Deed dated May 1st, 1886, executed by Channaborappanavara Andanappa, in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
2. Sale Deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Krishnappa and his brother's son Munisamappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
3. Sale Deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Boranayka, son of Giddappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
4. Sale Deed dated May 16th, 1886, executed by Mallikarjunappa, son of Yentaganahalli Kappanna, in favour of Mr. K.Seshadri Iyer.
5. Sale Deed dated May 31st, 1886, executed by Yellamma, wife of Nangundahalli Channappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
6. Sale Deed dated June 21st, 1886, executed by Mareppa in favor of Mr. Seshadri Iyer.
7. Sale Deed dated March 23rd, 1887, executed by Mariappa in favor of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
8. Sale Deed dated April 4th, 1887, executed by Nagondahalli Channappa's wife Yellamma and her son Narayani in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
   (a) Sale Deed dated February 10th, 1876, executed by Hivanarangamma in favour of Munisamappa.
   (b) Sale Deed dated July 25th, 1878, executed by Munisamappa in favor of Narasimhanna.
   (c) Court Certificate issued by the First Division Munsiff, Bangalore, in favor of Narasimhanna dated the 23rd February 1883.
   (d) Sale Deed dated March 24th, 1883, executed by Narasimhanna in favor of Muniappa.
9. Sale deed dated 4th April 1887, executed by Muganna and his sons Muniappa and Channappa in favor of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
10. Sale Deed dated April 14th, 1887, executed by Uddanappa in favor of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.
11. Sale Deed dated July 30th, 1887, executed by Kunchigaradyava and his son Narasimhanna in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

12. Sale Deed dated August 19th, 1887, executed by (1) Chinnaiya, (2) Doddaiya, (3) Munisamy in favour of Mr. K.Seshadri Iyer.

13. Sale Deed dated December 11th 1887, executed by Venkamma wife of Venkataramaiya in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

14. (a) Deed of Mortgage dated November 8th 1849 executed by Sunkada Appajappa in favour of Jangamakote Srinivasa Rao.

(b) Receipt dated 8th November 1849 given by Sunkada Appajappa in favour of Jangamakote Srinivasa Rao.

14. Sale Deed dated 11th April 1888 executed by Seshagiriappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

15. Sale Deed dated 23rd May 1888, executed by Mysore Narayana Rao in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

15 (a) Sale Deed dated 22nd March 1871, executed by Nanjunda Bhatta in favour of Krishnappa.

15 (b) Sale Deed dated 26th August 1885 executed by Krishnaji and his son Mavji in favour of Mr. Narayan Rao.

16. Sale Deed dated the 21st November 1918 executed by Mr. K.S. Ramaswami Iyer and four other in favour of the Dewan of Mysore.

17. Power of Attorney dated 16th November 1918 given by Messrs. K.V. Venkataramaiyer alias Venkatram, V. Seshadri and K. Subramania Iyer alias Subramania K. Seshadri in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

18. Copy of Power of Attorney dated 27th June 1917, given by Mr. A.M. Sundara Murthi Mudaliar and four others in favour of Mr. D. Raghavachar, B.A., B.L., Advocate.

19. Copy of Mortgage Deed dated 31st December 1903 executed by Mr. K. Doraswami Iyer and four others in favour of Messrs. A. Narainsami Mudaliar & Co., Mysore Hall, Bangalore.

20. Copy of reconveyance dated 21st November 1918, executed by Messrs. A. Narainsami Mudaliar & Co., through their representative Mr. D. Raghavachar in favour of Messrs. K.S.Ramaswami Iyer and S. Srikantesvara Aiyar.

~~24th~~ June 9

4188/CB

I am desired to forward herewith two sale deeds together with copies of certain documents as per list enclosed, for safe custody in the State Huzur Treasury.

M. Viraraja Urs, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Comptroller to Government.

State Loans ..... DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVERNMENT.

Dated Bangalore, 28th June *1939.*

No. A. UR 3536

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government of Mysore
Bangalore

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of ~~the following received with~~ your letter No. 4188/CB dated 27th inst, with Contents as Stated therein

CHIEF SECRETARY
CB
29. JUN. 19
GOVT. OF MYSORE

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. Narasimhacha
Asst. Comptroller.

List of documents forwarded to the Comptroller to Govt., with the Chief Secretary's D. O. letter No.

for safe custody.

IN ORIGINAL:

1. Registered Sale Deed dated 20.7.1913 relating to the purchase by Govt. of the site opposite the Indian Guests' Quarters, Mysore, executed by the late Mr. K. Doraswamy Iyer and his brothers.

2. Registered Sale Deed dated 21.11.18 relating to the purchase of "Kumara Park", Bangalore, executed by Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyer and four others in favour of the Dewan of Mysore.

COPIES OF THE FOLLOWING:--

3. Sale deed dated May 1st, 1886, executed by Channaborappanavara Uddanappa, in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

4. Sale deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Krishnappa and his brother's son Munisamappa in favour of Mr. K.Seshadri Iyer.

5. Sale deed dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Boranayka, son of Giddappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

6. Sale desd dated May 14th, 1886, executed by Mallikarjunappa, son of Yentaganahalli Kappanna, in favour of Mr.K.Seshadri Iyer.

7. Sale deed dated May 31st, 1886, executed by Yellamma, wife of Nangundahalli Channappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

8. Sale deed dated June 21st, 1886, executed by Mareppa in favor of Mr. Seshadri Iyer.

9. Sale deed dated March 23rd, 1887, executed by Huriappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

10. Sale deed dated April 4th, 1887, executed by Nagondahalli Channappa's wife Yellamma and her son Narayani in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

11. Sale deed dated February 10th, 1876, executed by Hivanafangamma in favour of Munisamappa.

12. Court Certificate issued by the First Division Munsiff, Bangalore, in favour of Narasimhanna dated the 23rd February 1883.

13. Sale deed dated March 24th, 1883, executed by Narasimhanna in favour of Muniappa.

14. Sale deed dated 4th April 1887, executed by Bhyganna and his sons Muniappa and Channappa in favour of Mr. K.Seshadri Iyer.

15. Sale deed dated April 14th, 1887, executed by Uddanappa in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

16. Sale deed dated July 30th, 1887, executed by Kunchigaradyava and his son Narasimhanna in favour of Mr. K.Seshadri Iyer.

17. Sale deed dated August 19th, 1887, executed by (1) Chinnaiya, (2) Doddaiya, (3) Munisamy in favour of Mr. K. Seshadri Iyer.

18. Sale deed dated December 11th 1887, executed by Venkamma wife of Venkataramaiya in favour of Mr.K.Seshadri Iyer.

19. Sale deed dated 26th August 1885 executed by Krishnaji and his son Mavji in favour of Mr. Narayan Rao.

20. Copy of reconveyance dated 21st November 1918, executed by Messrs. A. Narainsami Mudaliar & Co., through their representative Mr. D. Raghavachar in favour of Messrs. K.S.Ramaswami Iyer and C.Srikantesvara Aiyar.